

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Independent Midterm Evaluation of the Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (LEAP) Project

International Rescue Committee &
Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale
Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16571-07-75-K



2009

ICF MACRO
an ICF International Company

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Independent Midterm Evaluation of the Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (LEAP) Project

International Rescue Committee &
Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale
Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16571-07-75-K

2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the midterm evaluation, conducted during October 2009, of the Livelihoods Education and Protection to End Child Labor (LEAP) Project in Uganda. The report was prepared by ICF Macro, according to agreements specified in its contract with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of the LEAP project in Uganda was conducted and documented by Dr. Martina Nicolls, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the LEAP project team, and stakeholders in Uganda. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator; the International Rescue Committee, *Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale* (Association for Volunteers in International Service), and their partners; and the U.S. Department of Labor.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLB089K28215. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

THANKS

I would like to thank the line ministries' staff in Uganda who took the time and interest to participate in the midterm evaluation of the Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (LEAP) project. These specifically include the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development, the National Council for Children, the Child Labor Unit, the Ministry of Education and Sports, and the National Curriculum Development Center. In addition, I would like to thank all school principals, head teachers, teachers, School Management Committees, Parent-Teacher Associations, guidance counselors, vocational trainers, artisans, and administrative staff for their time and cooperation during the evaluator's institutional visits. I also thank district education officers, district inspectors of schools, district labor officers, district protection officers, district child labor committees, child protection committees, staff of Child and Family Protection Units of the national police force, parish chiefs, members of Village Savings and Loans Associations, and members of women's and youth groups.

I also thank the United States Embassy personnel, the International Labour Organization staff in Uganda, and staff of the Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation at the University of Kyambogo in Kampala.

In particular, I would like to thank the LEAP project management team and field office staff of the International Rescue Committee and the *Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale* (Association for Volunteers in International Service) for their flexibility, planning and preparation, logistical support, organization of field visits, and the use of office space and equipment, translators, drivers, and support staff—all of whom contributed to ensuring an effective midterm evaluation.

I would like to send special thanks to all beneficiaries, particularly primary and secondary school students, youth in vocational institutions and apprenticeship programs, and Primary Teachers' College students for their willingness to tell me of their experiences, views, and opinions, as well as for their poems and dramas, providing me with lasting memories.

I express my deepest gratitude to all.

Dr. Martina Nicolls
LEAP Evaluator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
MAP OF UGANDA	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xi
I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	1
1.1 Scope of Evaluation	1
1.2 Midterm Evaluation Objectives	1
1.3 Evaluation Methodology	2
1.4 Document Review	2
1.5 Field Visits	2
1.6 Interviews with Stakeholders	3
1.7 Stakeholder Meeting	3
1.8 Structure of the Report	3
II CHILD LABOR IN NORTHERN UGANDA	5
2.1 USDOL's Previous Child Labor Experiences in Uganda	5
2.2 Government of Uganda Child Labor and Education Policies	6
2.3 Donor Agency Activities in Child Labor and Related Programs in Northern Uganda	8
III PROJECT DESCRIPTION	11
3.1 Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor Project in Uganda: LEAP	11
IV RELEVANCE	13
4.1 Findings	13
4.2 Project Design: Lessons Learned	21
4.3 Project Design: Best Practices	22
V EFFECTIVENESS	23
5.1 Findings	23
5.2 Effectiveness of Direct Action: Education Interventions	25
5.3 Effectiveness of Services	27
5.4 Effectiveness of Models	28
5.5 Effectiveness of the Monitoring System	30

5.6	Effectiveness of the Management System	32
5.7	Implementation: Lessons Learned	34
5.8	Implementation: Best Practices	34
VI	EFFICIENCY	37
6.1	Findings	37
6.2	Efficiency: Best Practices	38
VII	IMPACT	41
7.1	Impact on Livelihoods	41
7.2	Impact on Education Quality	41
7.3	Impact on Child Protection and Child Labor	42
7.4	Emerging Issues	46
7.5	Impact: Lessons Learned	47
7.6	Impact: Best Practices	48
VIII	SUSTAINABILITY	49
8.1	Findings	49
8.2	Sustainability: Lessons Learned	52
8.3	Sustainability: Best Practices	52
IX	DISCUSSION	53
9.1	Summary of Lessons Learned	53
9.2	Summary of Best Practices	54
X	RECOMMENDATIONS	57
10.1	Key Recommendations	57

ANNEXES

Annex A: List of Documents Reviewed

Annex B: Itinerary Schedule

Annex C: List of People Interviewed

Annex D: Stakeholder Meeting Agenda

Annex E: Stakeholder Meeting Participants

Annex F: Terms of Reference

MAP OF UGANDA



LIST OF ACRONYMS

ABEK	Alternative Basic Education in Karamoja
ALP	Alternative Learning Program
AVSI	<i>Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale</i> (Association for Volunteers in International Service)
BEPS	Basic Education Policy Support (BEPS III Project)
CAII	Creative Associates International, Inc.
CBT	Community-Based Trainer
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CPA	Cooperative Peace Agreement
CPC	Child Protection Committee
DCLC	District Child Labor Committee
DEO	District Education Office
EI	Education Initiative
ERD	Economic Recovery Development
GE	General Electric
GEM	Girls Education Movement
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act of 1993
IEC	Instructional Education Communication
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILO-IPEC	International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KURET	Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together
LEAP	Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sports
NCC	National Council for Children

NCDC	National Curriculum Development Center
NCLP	National Child Labor Policy
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NUMAT	Northern Uganda Malaria, AIDS, and Tuberculosis
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
ORACLE	Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent Child Labor Through Education
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PIASCY	Presidential Initiative on AIDS Strategy for Communication to Youth
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
REPLICA	Revitalization of Education Participation and Learning in Conflict Areas
RFA	Rapid Field Assessment
SCREAM	Supporting Children Rights Through Education, the Arts, and the Media
SMC	School Management Committee
SNAP	Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor
SPRING	Stability, Peace, and Reconciliation in Northern Uganda
TDMS	Teachers' Development Management System
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNITY	Uganda Initiative for TDMS and PIASCY
UPE	Universal Primary Education
UPHOLD	Uganda Program for Human and Holistic Development
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labor
USE	Universal Secondary Education
VSLA	Village Savings and Loans Association
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor
WSIP	Whole School Improvement Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 30, 2007, the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and *Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale* (Association for Volunteers in International Service or AVSI) received a four-year cooperative agreement worth US\$5,499,997 from the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) to implement an Education Initiative project in Uganda. As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targets 2,825 children for withdrawal and 8,450 for prevention from the worst forms of child labor (WFCL). Project interventions focus on children affected by armed conflict in the northern districts of Kitgum, Lira, Pader, and Gulu, as well as the northeastern Moroto District in the Karamoja region. IRC operates in Kitgum, Lira, and Moroto districts, and AVSI operates in Gulu and Pader districts.

The program was designed around a school-based and community-supported multifaceted approach in which IRC and AVSI provided a solid foundation for child labor awareness-raising and sensitization. Interventions support children withdrawn and prevented from labor to access relevant educational services, and provide them with counseling and student materials. The interventions receive extensive support at ministry, district, and community levels.

RELEVANCE

The three major components of the project are (1) livelihoods, (2) education, and (3) child protection. Based upon the experiences of recent previous USDOL-funded child labor programs in northern Uganda (ORACLE¹ and KURET²), the Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (LEAP) project formulated components, sectors, and activities to provide critical strategies for the sustainable prevention and withdrawal of children from exploitive child labor. The complementary and integrated strategies have all combined—particularly at the district and school levels—to provide relevant methods for achieving project objectives and outputs. Such strategies include providing appropriate education interventions, refining activities to their geographical contexts, mapping child labor sites (to assist school selection criteria), beneficiary selection criteria, capacity building, a whole school improvement program, and a Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS). Additional national level strategies, such as policy support, awareness-raising, and the infusion of child labor issues into the primary school curriculum and Kyambogo University courses, also contribute to the relevance of project strategies in working toward its objectives.

The evaluator found that significant efforts have been made to ensure compatibility with other child labor programs and activities. At the government level, the project works in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Sports, the Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development, the International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC), and other stakeholders. With these partners, the project works toward the development, facilitation, or continuation of initiatives such as the popular version of the National Child Labor Policy, the National Plan of Action for the

¹ Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent Child Labor Through Education.

² Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together.

Elimination of Child Labor, the Orphans and Vulnerable Children Policy, and the National Youth Policy.

EFFECTIVENESS

The LEAP project is on track to meet its targets for withdrawing and preventing 11,275 children at risk of, or involved in, exploitive labor. At midterm, the project has enrolled 7,538 students (67% of the target and 2% more than the planned/expected enrollment). The project expected that its beneficiaries would comprise 25% *withdrawn* and 75% *prevented* from exploitive labor. At midterm, the project has in fact withdrawn 1,903 students (25%) and prevented 5,635 students (75%). The project's aim was to target 5,768 (51%) girls, derived from the total population of girls in the five districts. As of September 2009, the project had enrolled 50.5% girls.

To date, there is an overall average persistence rate of 96%: All students are persisting in apprenticeship programs, 95% of girls and 85% of boys in vocational programs, 93% of girls and 98% of boys in secondary programs, and 97% for both girls and boys in primary school. Of the 3% of overall dropouts, 65% are from primary schools (55% girls and 45% boys) and 32% are from secondary schools (82% girls and 18% boys). Hence, despite the government's Universal Primary Education policy, there is a high dropout rate at primary level reflected in the LEAP project (66% of dropouts in all government primary schools according to the Government of Uganda's 2006 census). The government notes no significant difference in the dropout rate between girls and boys at primary level. However, girls are more likely to drop out of school at secondary level.

The project uses a comprehensive and holistic approach to school improvement, called the Whole School Improvement Program. This program includes the provision of technical support (such as livelihood skills), management guidance, training (such as classroom management and innovative teaching and learning methodologies), awareness-raising on child labor and child protection issues (to beneficiaries, line ministries, and the wider community), the provision of school equipment and materials, community participation (in-school development activities), and the involvement of School Management Committees, and Parent-Teacher Associations. This approach to school improvement is a major factor in the project's success, in addition to the provision of effective education interventions for beneficiaries. This includes the enrollment of teacher candidates into Primary Teachers' Colleges to potentially increase the number of teachers—particularly females—and the provision of remedial programs in primary, secondary, vocational, and teacher training to enhance student performance.

To provide livelihood support to families, the project introduced Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLA). By potentially increasing family income, the project aims to free families from their dependence on children's work and enable parents to send their children to school. VSLA members used the loans to start small businesses, predominantly selling groceries at the market. In addition to improving their individual financial situation, some VSLAs also established a kitty to fund community development projects, such as restoring school blackboards.

An impressive element of the LEAP project is its adherence to the government's Inclusive Education policy—to provide education for all—by including children with special needs as project beneficiaries and providing a range of awareness-raising activities that nurture inclusivity. These activities are provided to teachers, School Management Committees, Parent-Teacher Associations, government line ministries, and the wider community. The LEAP project collaborated with Kyambogo University to infuse child labor, life skills, gender, inclusive education, and child protection issues into the teacher training curriculum within the Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation. The project also collaborated with the National Curriculum Development Center to infuse child labor and cross-cutting issues into the primary school curriculum.

Tracking and monitoring the highly mobile student beneficiaries has proven to be a challenge addressed by the project. The project implements a two-point strategy using a community-based CLMS with (1) regular follow-up of all beneficiaries (every six months) and (2) a verification process (every term) to confirm beneficiaries' age, attendance, and knowledge of child labor, and to check on community-based child labor monitors. Hence, the project successfully monitors the highly mobile student beneficiaries through a comprehensive and rigorous process.

EFFICIENCY

The project has had severe financial constraints placed upon it due to the initial budget inadequately accounting for the cost of its livelihood component. The result of this is that the LEAP project has had to solve the situation using creative and imaginative means, as well as scaling down all activities in the final fourth year to serve basically as a monitoring phase. The evaluator found that the management staff worked closely with the regional office staff to openly address the funding situation, and every project member has worked as a team for the effective and efficient use of resources to resolve implementation issues pertaining to budget implications. Piloting programs has been used extensively by the LEAP project, which is a cost-efficient means of pre-testing activities before wider implementation.

IMPACT

During the field visit, stakeholders confirmed that the impact of the LEAP project on education quality, to date, included (1) an increase in enrollments; (2) supply of materials, such as science equipment, that they did not have previously; (3) improvement of student performance through remedial lessons; (4) support to the music, dance, and drama clubs; (5) sensitizing the community to child labor and the importance of education; and (6) easier monitoring of students (especially due to the follow-ups). The main impact, to date, of the awareness-raising and sensitization of parents and community groups is the importance of education, the return of children to school, and the heightening of child protection issues.

School clubs with activities related to combating child labor are active and successful due to having a teacher attached to the clubs that provides direction, and constant communication with parents. The activities are part of the school core curriculum and they are well planned.

Government officials at the district level—particularly within the education and labor ministries—are committed, serious, and active in their efforts to combat child labor. At the district level, the LEAP project has worked with District Councils to progress ordinances in Gulu, Lira, and Kitgum. At the national level, the government has taken a number of measures to progress child labor policies and strategies.

SUSTAINABILITY

The LEAP project has an exit/phase-out strategy and sustainability plan, and has initiated parallel plans at each regional/district LEAP project office, as well as with District Education Offices (DEOs). These were developed in the early stages of the project and discussed with partners, government stakeholders, and schools to prepare them to take over responsibilities and/or activities to the degree in which they are capable. The level of national and local government involvement in the project and commitment to working toward child labor elimination is high. DEOs were already identifying activities that they could sustain, such as infusion of child labor issues into government committees, meetings, strategic plans, and guidelines. Public campaigning, advocacy, sensitization, and awareness-raising are other areas stakeholders believe can be sustained—from national level to district and school level. To complement exit and sustainability plans, government and community involvement, and policy reform, the LEAP project has taken additional steps to promote the sustainability of project components through a school-based approach to awareness-raising and training. It involves a wide array of actors such as students, teachers, School Management Committees, Parent-Teacher Associations, and interested community members to conduct sensitization training. The school is therefore the entry point to awareness-raising. Aspects of this approach include peer learning (in which students learn from each other, parents learn from each other, and teachers learn from each other) and cross-generational cooperation (particularly through the participation of students and parents in school activities and development decisions).

WEAKNESSES

Apprenticeship activities are working well in Kitgum and Lira, as they are older, more stable, and more established districts. In Gulu District, the apprenticeship program has not yet started and the LEAP project team, together with the district, has expressed interest in replicating what is happening in Kitgum District. Activities are currently not operating in Pader and Moroto districts due to a lack of artisans—predominantly due to the districts being newly established or having recently become more stable. Hence, the weakness in the apprenticeship approach is the availability, selection, and quality of artisans within a reasonable distance of the targeted students.

The weakness in the provision of vocational training is selecting suitable vocational institutions. For example, the only vocational institute in Moroto District is a private organization with strict selection criteria that the LEAP project and its beneficiaries do not meet.

A current weakness of the project is the monitoring of beneficiaries on weekends and during school holidays. The evaluator witnessed beneficiary children working on the weekend in a

garden and stone quarry. When questioned, and during interviews, the children did not identify the weekend work as child labor because it did not interfere with their schooling. Hence, closer monitoring of students on weekends and vacations is required to determine the extent and number of hours children are working.

Another weakness is the current policy on follow-up forms *not* to capture working hours *if* the child's status is *withdrawn* or *prevented*. Only the forms that were checked *not yet* for withdrawn or prevented status record information about child work: the number of days worked per week, the number of hours worked per day, and whether the child works for pay, no pay, or in-kind. This is essential information to facilitate counseling if the number of hours worked is increasing, and it would provide evidence of success if the number of hours worked is decreasing. The project does record overall status at the field level during regular follow-ups—that is, whether the beneficiary is still in hazardous work, regular work, or no work; hence, the figures reported to USDOL would not appear to be impacted. However, information on the number of hours worked would provide verification that beneficiaries were truly withdrawn or prevented. It is recommended that working hours be captured for each beneficiary during intake and that every follow-up be reproduced in table form for reporting purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following key recommendations are provided for consideration to successfully meet project objectives:

1. Capture working hours for each student beneficiary on intake forms and every follow-up form by amending the process for follow-up and data entry (i.e., record the number of days worked per week, the number of hours worked per day, and whether the child works for pay, no pay, or in-kind).
2. Monitor students closely on weekends and school vacations to prevent relapse into WFCL and consider documenting the results as action research for wider dissemination.
3. Conduct information-sharing visits and exchanges for LEAP project staff and other partners, teachers, and students between operational districts to discuss implementation strategies and for networking on a peer-to-peer basis (students in particular are information-deprived, especially in Moroto District, and have expressed a desire to speak to other students) or interest basis.
4. Place a key focus on action research for the remaining two years, such as youth action research, labor market skills analysis, child trafficking, HIV/AIDS behavior change, and sexual and gender-based violence and its impact on child labor (as documented in the project design).
5. Scale up VSLAs in all districts.

6. Monitor the employment options and opportunities for graduating students from vocational and apprenticeship programs and consider documenting the results as action research on graduate employment.
7. Continue teacher training as planned for secondary schools, particularly in guidance and counseling.
8. Reconsider the implementation of the apprenticeship model in all districts.
9. Provide further research to track the impact of remedial classes.
10. Monitor and document the parent cost-sharing intervention during its pilot phase, particularly to determine whether students will relapse into exploitive labor if parents cannot afford to participate in cost-sharing.
11. Continue discussions with the National Curriculum Development Center regarding collaboration to infuse child labor and life skills into the secondary school curriculum.

I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (LEAP) project was due for a midterm evaluation in 2009; it was conducted from October to November, with an in-country field visit from October 17 to November 5, 2009.

1.1 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The scope of the evaluation includes an assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL cooperative agreement with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and *Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale* (Association for Volunteers in International Service or AVSI); from project design, implementation, and management to internal monitoring, sustainability, and exit preparations. The evaluation assesses the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives, as outlined in the cooperative agreement (referred to as the project document).

Within this scope, and in addition to serving as a midway accountability function to review and recommend adjustments and improvements in implementation and management, the evaluation provides emerging lessons learned and potential best practices.

1.2 MIDTERM EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the midterm evaluation is as follows:

1. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government.
2. Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so.
3. Provide recommendations for how the project can successfully overcome challenges to meet its objectives and targets by project end.
4. Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies and the project's strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and identify areas in need of improvement.
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations, and identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives.

1.3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation approach was independent, taking into consideration the triangulation of data for validity, representation from a wide range of stakeholders, child-sensitive approaches, gender and cultural sensitivities, flexibility, and consistencies or divergences between project operational sites. The evaluator used translators/interpreters with regional language ability where appropriate in the field. Hence, three translators were employed on a temporary, contractual basis. The LEAP project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E)/field manager for Lira traveled with the evaluator to make introductions and ensure efficient logistics, but was not involved in the evaluation process. He also provided information on Lira District, which was not visited by the evaluator.

1.4 DOCUMENT REVIEW

Before the evaluator traveled to Uganda, preparations included an extensive review of relevant documents. During fieldwork, documentation was verified and additional documents were reviewed. Documentation included the cooperative agreement, technical progress reports, monitoring plans and guidelines, work plans, operational guidelines, research or other reports, and project files (Annex A).

1.5 FIELD VISITS

During the two-week fieldwork, the evaluator visited four out of the five districts (80% district coverage) in which the LEAP project operates, selected in collaboration with implementing partners IRC and AVSI. The evaluator visited the northern districts of Gulu, Kitgum, and Pader; the northeastern district of Moroto in the Karamoja region; and Kampala, the capital. Lira District was not visited due to time constraints.³ The evaluator visited 11 of the 20 project-supported sub-counties/municipalities (55% sub-county coverage): all four in Moroto, three of the four sub-counties in Gulu, two of the four sub-counties in Pader, and two of the four in Kitgum.

The fieldwork included visiting sites that depict strengths and that are experiencing challenges, and the sites represented a range of targeted child labor sectors and geographic regions. Within each district, the evaluator visited education intervention sites (primary, secondary, vocational training sites, apprenticeship centers, and primary teachers' colleges [PTCs]). The evaluator visited 6 of the 31 project-supported primary schools (19% coverage), 4 of the 24 supported secondary schools (16% coverage), 2 of the 10 vocational centers (20% coverage), 2 of the 15 supported apprenticeship centers (13% coverage), and 2 of the 4 PTCs (50% coverage). The evaluator also visited five sites where child laborers were removed (such as stone quarries and town markets), as well as government offices, women's groups, Parent-Teacher Associations

³ The evaluator had previously interviewed stakeholders in Lira District in September 2008 under the auspices of the final evaluation of the USDOL-funded Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) project.

(PTAs), School Management Committees (SMCs), Child Protection Committees, and Child Labor Committees. (An itinerary is provided in Annex B.)

1.6 INTERVIEWS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator created a question matrix as a guide, sorted into stakeholder groups to ensure all evaluation questions were covered and all stakeholders were represented. Informational interviews were held with as many project stakeholders as possible. These meetings were with individuals, small groups, interest groups, and stakeholder groups, as well as with project staff, government staff, community leaders, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), donor representatives, and direct or indirect beneficiaries. (A list of stakeholders interviewed is provided in Annex C.)

1.7 STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Following the field visits, a stakeholder meeting was conducted by the evaluator to bring together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The list of participants was drafted before the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork, and was limited to approximately 25 to 30 key stakeholders. The stakeholder meeting aimed to present the major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit further information, obtain clarification, and validate evaluation observations. The agenda of the meeting was determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. (The agenda is provided in Annex D and the list of participants is provided in Annex E.)

1.8 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Evaluation questions provided in the Terms of Reference in Annex F are organized under five assessment areas: (1) relevance; (2) effectiveness; (3) efficiency; (4) impact; and (5) sustainability. These assessment areas form the structure for the report.

The Relevance section covers the cultural, economic, and political context of the project in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the Government of Uganda and USDOL. The Effectiveness section assesses the extent to which the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward them. The Efficiency section provides an analysis of the strategies employed by the project in terms of the resources used (inputs) compared with its qualitative and quantitative impacts (outputs). Where possible at the halfway point of the project, impact assesses the positive and negative changes, intended and unintended, direct and indirect, of the project's activities on the beneficiaries, taking into account the social and economic environment of Uganda. The Sustainability section provides an account of the project's steps to ensure continuation of activities or components on completion of the project, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government.

The report is therefore structured around the five main evaluation criteria, presenting findings, lessons learned, and best practices. Following the five main sections, the report concludes with recommendations based on the key findings.

II CHILD LABOR IN NORTHERN UGANDA

In northern Uganda, children work predominantly in crop farming, commercial agriculture, commercial fishing, brick making and laying, stone quarrying and crushing, charcoal burning, hunting, firewood collecting, and domestic work. They also work in the urban informal sector selling small items on the streets, and work in shops, garages, bars, and restaurants. It is also common for children in northern Uganda to work in cross-border trade with counterparts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sudan. Some children as young as age 10 are victims of commercial sexual exploitation, and Uganda is a source, destination, and transit country for the trafficking of children.⁴

2.1 USDOL'S PREVIOUS CHILD LABOR EXPERIENCES IN UGANDA

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Uganda, having devoted over US\$14.7 million since 1999 to combat child labor solely in Uganda. USDOL has also contributed over US\$27.5 million to regional projects in Africa, including Uganda.

USDOL funded a US\$3.6 million four-year Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent Child Labor Through Education (ORACLE) project, implemented by IRC and AVSI, which ended in August 2007 and withdrew or prevented 5,657 children from exploitive labor in northern Uganda.⁵ ORACLE established the foundation for the LEAP project, evaluated under the Terms of Reference with the same implementing partners. USDOL also funded the US\$3 million International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) project, Combating and Preventing HIV/AIDS-Induced Child Labor in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Action in Uganda and Zambia, which ended in December 2008. In total across both countries, the project withdrew 2,642 children and prevented an additional 2,072 children from exploitive child labor through the provision of education, 2,942 of them from Uganda.⁶ USDOL funded the US\$14.5 million four-year Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) project with additional funds by World Vision (US\$5.8 million), which ended in March 2009. In Uganda, the project withdrew and prevented 8,176 children from exploitive child labor.⁷

USDOL also currently funds a four-year, US\$4.8 million project, Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor (SNAP), implemented by ILO-IPEC.⁸ The project aims to withdraw 2,712 children and prevent 5,426 children from exploitive child labor in agriculture, commercial sexual exploitation, fishing, domestic work, construction, mining, quarrying, and the urban informal sector. The project will

⁴ U.S. Department of Labor, *USDOL's 2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor*, p. 341.

⁵ U.S. Department of Labor, *Final Evaluation of ORACLE*, p. 343.

⁶ ILO-IPEC, *Combating and Preventing HIV/AIDS-Induced Child Labour in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Action in Uganda and Zambia*, Final Report, December 10, 2008, p. 33.

⁷ Macro International, *Independent Final Evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) Project*, 2009, p. 12.

⁸ ILO-IPEC, *Project of Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor*, Project Document, Geneva, September 26, 2008.

also contribute to the development of “child labor-free zones” in Wakiso, Rakai, and Mbale districts.⁹ SNAP will continue to strengthen Uganda’s legal, policy, institutional, and social areas, including the Ugandan Decent Work Country Programme.

By overlapping child labor projects in Uganda, USDOL will maintain an in-country presence and an ongoing relationship with the Government of Uganda for nine years (2003–2012), providing support to at least 36,074 direct beneficiaries (Table 1).

Table 1: Summary of USDOL-Funded Child Labor Projects in Uganda

Characteristic	ORACLE	ILO-IPEC	KURET	LEAP	SNAP
Full title	Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent and Child Labor Through Education	Combating and preventing HIV/AIDS-Induced Child Labor in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Actions in Uganda and Zambia	Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together	Livelihoods, Education, and Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda	Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor
Funding (in millions)	US\$3.6	US\$3	US\$14.5	US\$5.5	US\$4.8
Implementers	IRC, AVSI	ILO-IPEC	World Vision, IRC, AED	IRC, AVSI	ILO-IPEC
Duration	4 years: Oct 2003 to Oct 2007	3 years: Dec 2005 to Dec 2008	4 years: Sep 2004 to Mar 2009	4 years: Sep 2007 to Sep 2011	4 years: Dec 2008 to Dec 2012
Area	Northern Uganda	Uganda	Northern Uganda	Northern Uganda	Uganda
Districts	Kitgum, Pader	Kampala, Mukono, Mbale, Rakai	Arua, Gulu, Lira, Dokolo	Kitgum, Pader, Gulu, Lira, Moroto	Wakiso, Rakai, Mbale
Beneficiaries	5,657	2,942 in Uganda	8,176 in Uganda	Target is 11,275	Target is 8,138

Note: AED = Academy for Educational Development

2.2 GOVERNMENT OF UGANDA CHILD LABOR AND EDUCATION POLICIES

The Government of Uganda has implemented policy and legal frameworks to address child labor issues. The minimum age for admission to work in Uganda is 14 years, although children between the ages of 12 and 14 years may engage in light work. The law prohibits slavery and

⁹ Ibid., pp. 30–31, 46–48.

forced labor, and offenses related to trafficking in persons are also prohibited. The Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (MGLSD) is charged with enforcing child labor laws and investigates child labor complaints through district labor officers. Local district officials and labor inspectors in the north collaborated with ILO-IPEC to enhance their capacity to cover the region. This included increasing labor inspectors' mobility and information collection, and working with District Child Labor Committees (DCLCs), with the aim of overcoming the lack of resources in the north.

MGLSD increased the budget for the Child Labor Unit for fiscal year 2007, as a result of the official launch of the National Child Labor Policy (NCLP) in November 2006. However, the Government of Uganda has not yet fully implemented the national policy at the district and local levels.¹⁰ Strategies for implementation include advocacy and awareness-raising; addressing poverty and HIV/AIDS; access to education and vocational training; legislation and enforcement; withdrawal, rehabilitation, and alternatives for livelihoods; capacity building; coordination and networking; the formation of a national database; and mobilization of resources.¹¹ The Child and Family Protection Unit of the National Police participated in training 163 police, security, and other officials on child labor, with the support of ILO-IPEC. Uganda is an ILO-IPEC participating country and has ratified: ILO Convention 182 on the Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL) in 1999;¹² ILO Convention 138 on the Minimum Age for Admission to Employment (1973); UN conventions and protocols; and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (1991). The LEAP project works with MGLSD to facilitate child labor, child rights, and child protection issues in collaboration with ILO and other partners.

In 1997 the Government of Uganda introduced Universal Primary Education (UPE), free and compulsory education, and passed the Education Act in 2002. Hence, primary enrollment has increased from 62% in 1996 to more than 90% in 2007.¹³ However, only 8% of the population has completed primary education.¹⁴ By 2007, the Government of Uganda introduced Universal Secondary Education (USE), although this is not being fully actualized and enforcement is limited. Less than 1% of the population has completed secondary education.¹⁵ However, through education strategic plans and Vision 2025, the Government of Uganda has made a commitment to addressing education as a development priority. The LEAP project works with the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) to support the return of child workers to appropriate schooling, including encouraging the retention of students, the reduction of dropouts, and the quality of teaching and learning.

¹⁰ The progress of the National Child Labor Policy is discussed in the Impact section of this report.

¹¹ Government of Uganda, *National Child Labor Policy*, November 2006, pp. 29–44.

¹² International Labour Organization, Convention No. C182. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/ratific.pl?C182>

¹³ *AVSI Uganda 2008 Annual Report*, p. 5.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

2.3 DONOR AGENCY ACTIVITIES IN CHILD LABOR AND RELATED PROGRAMS IN NORTHERN UGANDA

In addition to the USDOL LEAP project and its implementing partners IRC and AVSI, there are five major donors supporting child labor and related programs in northern Uganda: (1) the U.S. Department of State; (2) the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID); (3) the International Organization for Migration (IOM); (4) the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF); and (5) World Vision.

In October 2002, USAID commenced a six-year Uganda Program for Human and Holistic Development (UPHOLD), implemented by JSI Research and Training Institute, Inc., to improve the quality and use of services in education, health, and HIV/AIDS through a people-centered approach across 34 districts. UPHOLD finished in September 2008. In August 2006, six districts from the USAID UPHOLD project were transferred to the Northern Uganda Malaria, AIDS, and Tuberculosis (NUMAT) program, implemented by JSI in partnership with the AIDS Information Center and World Vision. NUMAT is a five-year program operating in Gulu, Amuru, Kitgum, Lira, Pader, Amolatar, Dokolo, Apac, and Oyam. To date, it has provided over 43,000 residents with HIV/AIDS counseling and testing.¹⁶ NUMAT concludes in 2011.

World Vision has worked in northern Uganda since 1989 and was an implementing partner with IRC and the Academy for Educational Development to implement the KURET program from September 2004 to March 2009 in Arua, Gulu, and Lira districts. In addition to the NUMAT program, World Vision currently operates Children of War Centers to receive and counsel former child soldiers and abducted children, and to facilitate the reunion of the children with their families. To date, more than 15,000 children and youth have been assisted.¹⁷

From July 2005 to July 2006, USAID funded a one-year pilot project, Revitalization of Education Participation and Learning in Conflict Areas (REPLICA), to address the specific education needs of children, teachers, and parents in the conflict-affected regions of northern Uganda. It was implemented under the Basic Education Policy Support (BEPS III Project)¹⁸ by Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII).

In November 2006, USAID funded UNITY,¹⁹ a three-year task order to improve the quality of teacher education, primarily through PTCs; this partly continues the interventions under BEPS and is implemented by CAII. The project concludes in November 2009.

During fiscal year 2007, the U.S. Department of State funded a US\$380,000 project implemented by IOM. The project aims to reintegrate trafficking victims, including children from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Also during fiscal year 2007, USAID funded a

¹⁶ JSI Research and Training Institute, 2009. Available at <http://osiris.jsi.com>.

¹⁷ World Vision 2009, *Northern Uganda Crisis—Caution: Children at War*. Available at <http://www.worldvision.org>.

¹⁸ BEPS commenced in 2003 and concluded in 2006.

¹⁹ UNITY is the Uganda Initiative for TDMS and PIASCY. TDMS is the Teachers' Development Management System. PIASCY is the Presidential Initiative on AIDS Strategy for Communication to Youth.

US\$500,000 project implemented by IRC and UNICEF to provide care to returnees from abduction by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). UNICEF also promoted gender equality through the Girls Education Movement (GEM) clubs, a USAID-funded initiative. In addition, the European Commission provided US\$940,000 to UNICEF for the child protection program in northern Uganda, including support for formerly abducted children.

In February 2008, USAID commenced a three-year Stability, Peace, and Reconciliation in Northern Uganda (SPRING) project to mitigate the causes and consequences of the region's conflict in Kitgum, Gulu, Amuru, Pader, Oyam, and Lira. Its core components include access to justice, social inclusion, and economic security (promotion of high-yielding agricultural practices and improved market access). AVSI is part of the implementing team, with Emerging Markets Group, Cardno Agrisystems, and Straight Talk Foundation.

III PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 LIVELIHOODS, EDUCATION, AND PROTECTION TO END CHILD LABOR PROJECT IN UGANDA: LEAP

On September 30, 2007, IRC and AVSI received a four-year cooperative agreement worth US\$5,499,997 from USDOL to implement an Education Initiative (EI) project in Uganda. IRC and AVSI were awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targets 2,825 children for withdrawal and 8,450 for prevention from WFCL. The project will reach an additional 14,725 indirect beneficiaries. Project interventions focus on children affected by armed conflict in the northern districts of Kitgum, Lira, Pader, and Gulu, as well as Moroto District in the Karamoja region. IRC operates in Kitgum, Lira, and Moroto districts, and AVSI operates in Gulu and Pader districts (Table 2).

Table 2: Summary of LEAP Operational Districts and Sub-Counties

District	Sub-counties/municipalities	No. of sub-counties	Implementing partner
Gulu	Lakwana, Lalogi, Laroo (Gulu Municipality), Odek	4	AVSI
Kitgum	Kitgum Town Council, PadibeEast, Padibe West, Palabek Kal	4	IRC
Lira	Aloi, Amach, Lira, Ojwina Division (Municipality)	4	IRC
Moroto	Moroto Municipality (North & South), Matany, Nadunget	4	IRC
Pader	Acholibur, Adilang, Laguti, Lapul	4	AVSI

The project has three major components, under which certain activities can be categorized (Table 3).

Table 3: LEAP Components and Main Activities

Livelihoods	Education	Protection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonformal vocational training • Alternative Learning Program (apprenticeships) • Village Savings and Loans Associations • Business training • Trade startup kits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary • Secondary • Primary Teachers' Colleges • Whole School Improvement Program • Accelerated Learning Program (remedial classes) • Training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness-raising • Information, Education, and Communication materials • School clubs • Ordinances • Infusion of child labor into curriculum • Policy support

IV RELEVANCE

4.1 FINDINGS

The findings under this section are predominantly related to the initial project design, strategies, and the selection of geographical areas and sectors.

4.1.1 Five Education Initiative Goals

The five EI goals of all USDOL child labor projects are as follows:²⁰

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The five USDOL EI goals are embedded within the LEAP project's four outputs, as follows:²¹

1. Improve awareness and attitudes of relevant stakeholders about the value of education and the negative effects of child labor.
2. Improve quality of basic education options in target communities (in order to ensure that children who are engaged in or at risk of engaging in child labor go to school).
3. Ensure access to education is increased for children engaged in, or at risk of, child labor.
4. Improve monitoring of children through information sharing.

Under the quality and access to education outputs, the project withdraws or prevents children from exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services. The project strengthens policies on child labor and education, and the capacity of national institutions, under Outputs 1 and 3. Improved and expanded education infrastructure is addressed in the LEAP project under Output 2. Awareness-raising is implemented under Output 1, and supporting

²⁰ Terms of Reference, August 2009, p. 1.

²¹ Project Document, September 2007, p. 3.

research is implemented under Output 4. Sustainability of project activities has been addressed in the project under Output 3. Hence, the LEAP project design is supporting the five EI goals.

4.1.2 Selection of Regions

The LEAP project's rationale for targeting northern Uganda²² focused on the effects of the 20-year conflict with the LRA rebel group who kidnapped children and forced them to kill or become sex slaves to the army's officials, causing the internal displacement of almost 2 million people.²³ The project design document cited the high proportion of deaths in the region due to violence, with young males being the primary victims, leaving a disproportionate level of female- and child-headed households. Consequently, the levels of domestic violence and exploitive sex are high in the region. The HIV/AIDS prevalence in northern Uganda is above the national average of 6%, estimated at 8% to 9%. With numbers at nearly 2 million, Uganda has the largest proportion of children orphaned as a result of HIV/AIDS in the world, and 34% of Ugandan children age 5 to 17 work, estimated at 400,000 in northern Uganda.²⁴

Peace talks between LRA and the Government of Uganda have been an ongoing process with no resolution and no accord. Leaders of LRA are resisting signing peace documents because there is yet no agreement on their demand for the International Criminal Court not to intervene or hold them accountable. LRA has since moved into the Democratic Republic of the Congo and peace is progressively returning to northern Uganda. According to a September 2009 report from the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, over 80% of the people displaced during the war had returned to their original homes in Gulu, Kitgum, and Pader districts. No official camps exist in Lira District because all the internally displaced persons have moved to their original homes.

Moroto District in the Karamoja region is drought-prone, vulnerable to violence due to cattle raiding and inter-tribal violence, and—being in the poorest region in Uganda—has limited access to social services. Karamoja has the lowest socioeconomic indicators and the lowest human development index in Uganda with the highest mortality, illiteracy, malnutrition, orphan, and HIV/AIDS prevalence rates in the nation.²⁵ Previously, NGOs were not able to address the region's vulnerabilities due to the high level of insecurity and instability. However, NGOs have recently entered Karamoja to commence humanitarian and development assistance.

The project rightly targets the Moroto District in the Karamoja region as it is an area in dire need. Of the other districts—Kitgum, Pader, Lira, and Gulu—the project design focuses its rationale predominantly on Kitgum, Pader, and Gulu, with the exception of anecdotal evidence that commercial sexual exploitation is on the rise in Lira.²⁶ Hence, the project document makes a strong in-depth argument for targeting Kitgum, Pader, and Gulu, whereas it has a weaker rationale for targeting Lira. Lira's inclusion may be due to the high number of returnees that continue to require basic social services, and both IRC and AVSI have previously worked in the

²² Project Document, September 2007, p. 8.

²³ *AVSI Uganda 2008 Annual Report*, p. 5.

²⁴ Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2000/2001 cited 400,200 children, excluding Kitgum and Gulu.

²⁵ Project Document, September 2007, p. 10.

²⁶ Project Document, September 2007, p. 14.

district, but this was not specified in the project design. Given the severity of the child labor situation in Karamoja's neglected region and the limited resources in Pader due to its new status as a district (since 2003), it may have been more appropriate to focus on four districts, namely Moroto, Kitgum, Pader, and Gulu, with more resources targeted at Pader District and the Karamoja region.²⁷

Twenty sub-counties are targeted for support; four in each of the five districts. The rationale is to focus on a limited number to ensure manageability of the project. Given the project's limited resources and the extent of the child labor situation in northern Uganda, it was appropriate to use a child labor mapping exercise to select the sub-counties most in need of support in cooperation with the District Education Offices (DEOs).

4.1.3 Selection of Sectors and Project Components

The three major components of the project are (1) livelihoods, (2) education, and (3) child protection. Based upon the experiences of recent previous USDOL-funded child labor programs in northern Uganda (ORACLE and KURET), the LEAP project components, sectors, and activities provide critical priorities and strategies for the sustainable prevention and withdrawal of children from exploitive child labor. As a high priority for USDOL, since 2003 child labor EIs in Uganda have tried to ensure that children are withdrawn or prevented from WFCL through enrollment and retention in appropriate educational programs. Livelihoods and child protection have generally been embedded into the activities of USDOL-funded child labor programs and have not previously been a major focus or component. Hence, they have been underdeveloped across the regions in Uganda in which there is a high prevalence of child labor. Therefore, it was highly appropriate for the LEAP project to focus on livelihoods and child protection as the principle project components, in addition to education.

4.1.4 Project Assumptions

The following section outlines some assumptions made in the project design document and assesses whether they were accurate and realistic.

Action Research

The project design made assumptions that action research would prominently feature:

1. "More rigorous document and analysis are needed...pertaining to hours of work, exposure to risk, and impact of household work on schooling. This is an area that will be focused on for further research."²⁸

²⁷ Particularly with hindsight, and in light of funding concerns for 2011, outlined in the Efficiency section of this report.

²⁸ Project Document, September 2007, p. 26.

2. “AVSI...is also planning a youth livelihood program for Gulu, Kitgum, and Pader districts with a built-in research component... The SWAY²⁹ team will undertake this research component.”³⁰
3. In the table on LEAP Expected Results, the project will “conduct action research on sex work and child trafficking” and “conduct action research on gender-based violence and child labor (Karamoja).”³¹
4. “The project will partner with Ugandan universities and research centers.”³²
5. “The project will design research...[with] the Women’s Commission for Refugee Women and Children (WCRWC), Kyambogo University, and Makerere University.”³³

The document listed the following topics for action research:

- Youth action research
- A teacher needs assessment
- School facility needs assessment
- Labor market skills analyses
- Issues related to child sexual labor
- Child trafficking
- HIV/AIDS behavior change
- Education and child labor
- A longitudinal impact assessment of ORACLE beneficiaries
- Sexual and gender-based violence and impact on child labor (particularly in Karamoja).³⁴

At the midterm point, while the project has disseminated extensive information on child labor and related topics, the only action research conducted was in May 2009 entitled *Child Labor Situation Analysis Report* with regard to northern Uganda and Karamoja. The LEAP Revised Timeline in the March 2009 Technical Progress Report indicates that the youth action research will be conducted from May to July 2008, March to April 2009, and January to March 2010.

²⁹ SWAY is the Study of War Affected Youth in Northern Uganda.

³⁰ Project Document, September 2007, pp. 29–30.

³¹ Ibid., p. 47.

³² Ibid., p. 61.

³³ Ibid., p. 62.

³⁴ Project Document, September 2007, p. 62.

The school facilities needs assessment should have been completed by January 2008; the action research on sex workers, gender-based violence, and child labor should have all commenced during the period from June to December 2009. Action research has not yet been conducted as planned due to travel restrictions to Karamoja. The LEAP project team also wanted to involve Kyambogo University, but the timing was not conducive with their schedule.

The action research assumption in the project design was highly ambitious and unrealistic. However, the management team has proceeded to resolve the situation. In September 2009, the timeline was readjusted and in November the management team met to plan action research methodology and how to ensure maximum participation of youth.³⁵ Hence, a draft document is being prepared. ILO and the Moroto PTC have agreed to participate in the planning process. The LEAP project is also planning to conduct a small sample survey on customer satisfaction of parents and beneficiaries.

Secondary Formal Education

The project design indicated that “in order to complement USE, which provides support in S1 and S2, students in S3 and S4 will be targeted.”³⁶ However, in Moroto District, a targeted secondary school only had students in S1 and S2. Hence, these students were targeted instead of S3 and S4 students. While the initial assumption was inaccurate, the LEAP project team was able to change their target beneficiary criteria to meet the needs of Moroto District and still maintain their targets. The project targeted 224 secondary students in Moroto for 2008–2009 and a total enrollment of 234 was achieved.³⁷

Skills Training—Livelihoods

The project design made a specific point of stating that “Karamoja beneficiaries will be enrolled in formal vocational skills training.”³⁸ This was not possible and hence there are no beneficiaries enrolled in formal vocational skills training in Karamoja. There is only one formal (private) vocational institution in Moroto District, which could not participate in the LEAP project because beneficiaries under the LEAP project selection criteria did not match the strict criteria for entry into formal vocational training. For example, the institution offered only a three-year course and the project’s aim was to support beneficiaries for two years. Hence, the target of 20 students has not been achieved.

Household Livelihoods Assets Improved

The project document stated that the project “will pilot savings, skills building, functional literacy, and other livelihoods activities to increase families’ abilities to meet their needs, rely

³⁵ IRC submitted the September 2009 LEAP Project Timeline to USDOL; the management team met during the evaluation.

³⁶ Project Document, September 2007, p. 55. USE is the government’s Universal Secondary Education policy, and S1–S4 indicates Secondary 1 to Secondary 4 (the first year of secondary school to the fourth year of secondary school).

³⁷ Statistics—targets and actual enrollments—provided by the LEAP project’s monitoring and evaluation advisor.

³⁸ Project Document, September 2007, p. 55.

less on child labor, and invest in their children's education," and envisioned "900 families benefiting from the livelihood activities."³⁹ The project design listed "other livelihood activities" expected to be supported by the project; one of them was the access of families to Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs). The VSLA activities are effective and by October 2009, 756⁴⁰ households were participating. More VSLA activities are planned for 2010. However, there are no VSLA activities in Moroto and many of the other listed activities have not been implemented. Therefore, while the target of 900 households is likely to be reached, the initial range and extent of livelihood activities listed in the project document were extremely ambitious and not achieved due to constraints in funding.

Whole School Improvement Program

The project design indicated that the project would "build the capacity of School Management Committees (SMC) and Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) to assess, respond, and monitor whole-school quality interventions" that "improve overall learning achievement, retention, and completion of its students."⁴¹ The Whole School Improvement Program (WSIP) has been implemented successfully with great enthusiasm and support from the targeted schools. Hence, this initial assumption has proven to be accurate and realistic.

Focus on Girls' Education

The project design does not place a major focus on the education of girls in northern Uganda, despite its many and varied references to the need for improved education, services, protection, and role models. It mentions the lack of teachers in the Karamoja region, in particular female teachers, and hence has a rationale for supporting the enrollment of students, particularly girls, into PTCs. However, it fails to mention the USAID GEM initiative in which clubs led by girls, with boys as strategic allies and adults as mentors, receive training on issues related to girls' education to further their enrollment and retention in school. Despite this oversight in the project design, the implementation of the project is heavily focused on supporting girls' education. The strategies implemented include (1) promoting and supporting strong female head teachers as role models in schools; (2) matching funds specifically designated to girls' education; (3) the provision of sanitary pads to girls and schools; (4) guidance and counseling rooms in schools; (5) mentoring sessions with girls; (6) supporting girls' enrollment in PTCs; (7) supporting girls to attend secondary boarding schools; and (8) ensuring at least 50% enrollment of girls into the LEAP project. Hence, the project design did not adequately articulate the project's approach to girls' education, which has been a major strength of its implementation.

4.1.5 Relevance of Project Strategies in Meeting Objectives

The complementary and integrated strategies—such as appropriate education interventions, refining activities to their geographical context, child labor sites mapping (to assist school selection criteria), beneficiary selection criteria, capacity building, WSIP, and a Child Labor

³⁹ Project Document, September 2007, pp. 55–56.

⁴⁰ LEAP, October 17, 2009, LEAP Project Summary, p. 6.

⁴¹ Project Document, September 2007, p. 58.

Monitoring System (CLMS)—have combined, particularly at the district and school levels, to provide relevant methods for achieving project objectives and outputs. Additional national-level strategies, such as policy support, awareness-raising, and the infusion of child labor issues into the primary school curriculum⁴² and Kyambogo University courses, also contribute to the relevance of project strategies in working toward its objectives.

4.1.6 Main Project Obstacles/Barriers

The project identified the following main obstacles or barriers to addressing child labor in northern Uganda and strategies for addressing them:⁴³

Table 4: Summary of Project Challenges

Challenges	Strategies to address challenges
Quality in education and retention of pupils through completion of the primary cycle remains a challenge.	WSIP will work with SMCs and PTAs in LEAP project schools to identify retention and completion barriers and encourage community-driven approaches to address them.
World Food Programme has moved from school feeding to Food for Education rations and they have been reduced. Food is still crucial to maintain enrollment and retention.	The project will work with SMCs and PTAs to mobilize parents and guardians to provide food, both in-kind and with monetary contribution for their children where possible.
Alternative and nonformal education programs offer flexible and culturally relevant learning but challenges remain in transitioning students into formal schools.	The project will target children completing nonformal courses for mainstreaming into appropriate education options.
UNICEF (2005) identified factors related to the schools that are undermining efforts to increase access and retention—inadequate quantity and poor condition of infrastructure; limited teaching and learning materials; lack or poor condition of water/sanitation facilities (particularly separate latrines for girls); short supply of teachers; teacher absenteeism; and non-friendly teaching methodologies.	The project will utilize the WSIP approach to provide critical teaching/learning materials to target schools. SMCs and PTAs will be provided with material support to identify and address barriers to girl child education. The project will collaborate with school inspectors and Coordinating Center tutors as well as SMCs to monitor teachers' attendance and effectiveness and provide on-the-job mentoring to improve teacher effectiveness. Additionally, the project will conduct a thorough teachers' training needs assessment to inform trainings and capacity building for teachers.

The project has addressed the barriers to quality education at the school level through WSIP, which has proven to be a successful contributor to improving quality teaching and learning in the project-targeted schools. The issue of encouraging retention and completion of primary school through school feeding, as stated in the project design, has not been addressed in its implementation. Limited funds have placed constraints on the option to consider school feeding, and therefore the project has instead further strengthened WSIP to retain students through the

⁴² Infused into P4–P7 curriculum (Primary 4 to Primary 7).

⁴³ Adapted from Project Document, September 2007, pp. 18–19.

extensive provision of school materials, teacher training, rehabilitation of facilities, and increased learning spaces.

In addition, the project realized the challenges in the Karamoja region, such as limited access to vocational and skills training to ensure relevant livelihoods opportunities for older youth, and is continually brainstorming ideas on how to address the situation. The government launched a Back to School campaign in Karamoja that has brought donor organizations to the region, and LEAP project staff members attend donor coordination meetings.

The project team is acutely aware of the challenges, barriers, and obstacles within each operational district—such as poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, mobility, and the issue that distance poses to access appropriate educational interventions—and has documented these, conducted staff workshops to address issues, and proactively sought solutions in collaboration with national-, district-, and school-level stakeholders.

4.1.7 Appropriateness of Project Design

The project design appropriately addressed the cultural, economic, and political context in each of its five operational districts. It documents and implements the “application of a two-track strategy, with one track strengthening household’s livelihood assets to sustain children’s education, and the second taking on the longer-term tasks of strengthening institutional capacities to create an enabling environment to implement and enforce child labor and education policy and programming, to mitigate the effects of conflict that pushed children into exploitive work.”⁴⁴ The project has specifically focused on the second track—designed to strengthen institutional capacities—with considerable success. Financial constraints have prevented the equivalent effort on the first track.

Specifically, the project design addresses the needs of children affected by war and conflict through the following means: (1) a context-specific situational analyses of social protection factors (i.e., education, livelihoods, and protection); (2) teacher training in guidance and counseling/psychosocial skills, and the establishment of some school-counseling rooms;⁴⁵ (3) support to children with disabilities and special needs, including the infusion of child labor into courses implemented by Kyambogo University’s Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation; and (4) the infusion of child labor, child rights, life skills, and child protection issues into government ordinances, primary education curriculums, university curriculums, awareness-raising, public campaigns, national policy, and national education strategies.

4.1.8 Compatibility of Project Design with Existing Initiatives

The LEAP project design maintains that its implementation will be compatible with existing government and other initiatives to combat child labor. The evaluator found that significant

⁴⁴ Project Document, September 2007, p. 3.

⁴⁵ LEAP project representatives are members of the Psychosocial Working Group, the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, the Emergency Education Cluster, and various associations in relation to children with disabilities and special needs.

efforts have been made to ensure compatibility with other child labor programs and activities. At the government level, the project works in cooperation with MGLSD, ILO-IPEC, and other stakeholders toward the development, facilitation, or continuation of initiatives such as the popular version of the NCLP, the National Plan of Action for the Elimination of Child Labor, the Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) Policy, the National Youth Policy, and the National Psychosocial Core Team. The project also works at the local level to build the capacity of probation and welfare officers and labor officers.⁴⁶

The project is compatible with the MOES initiatives such as UPE, USE, and the Back to School campaign in Karamoja. LEAP project regional teams work closely with DEOs and their school inspectors as well as DCLCs and Child Protection Committees.

Through networking, cooperation, and regular meetings, the LEAP project maintains compatibility of child labor activities with ILO-IPEC (and their USDOL-funded SNAP program), UNICEF (particularly in child protection, early childhood development, and nonformal education in northern Uganda and the Karamoja region), World Vision (particularly with NUMAT, returnees, and child protection), and Save the Children in Uganda (ABEK).⁴⁷

The project remains compatible with USAID-funded current and former projects, using existing educational material where appropriate, such as UPHOLD materials on HIV/AIDS, NUMAT (for malaria and AIDS-related materials), REPLICA (leadership and teaching quality in primary schools), UNITY materials (related to PTCs), and SPRING (in relation to justice, social inclusion, and economic security).

AVSI is also part of the SPRING implementing team. Together with the SPRING project, the LEAP project has coordinated the IRC and AVSI structures to support its activities, particularly in relation to its livelihoods and child protection components. The three components—livelihoods, education, and child protection—are a best-fit with IRC and AVSI program areas, such as with IRC's Economic Recovery Development (ERD), Education, Gender-Based Violence, and Peace Building programs; and with AVSI's Education, Health and HIV/AIDS, Disabilities, Return, Recovery and Development, and Water and Sanitation programs.

4.2 PROJECT DESIGN: LESSONS LEARNED

4.2.1 Extent and Range of Livelihood Activities

The project design listed numerous intended activities to introduce livelihood support to families of LEAP project beneficiaries and the extended community, which have proven to be overly ambitious in districts such as Moroto and Pader due to the lack of educational infrastructures, limited government resources, limited labor market opportunities and markets, geographical and cultural constraints, severe poverty, and years of conflict resulting in psychosocial impacts and

⁴⁶ Kitgum District does not have a labor officer and the labor officer in Pader District was only appointed in 2009.

⁴⁷ Alternative Basic Education in Karamoja.

institutional degradation. However, the major lesson is to adequately align the budget to fit the intended strategies and activities.

4.3 PROJECT DESIGN: BEST PRACTICES

4.3.1 Project Design Drawn from Lessons Learned

The project design has drawn from lessons learned during the implementation and evaluation of previous USDOL-funded child labor programs in Uganda, namely ORACLE and KURET, as well as ILO-IPEC's Combating and Preventing HIV/AIDS-Induced Child Labor in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Actions in Uganda and Zambia. Both IRC and AVSI implemented ORACLE, and IRC was a co-implementer of KURET. Both implementers have a long history in northern Uganda with experience and expertise in child labor projects and programs related to war-affected children and youth. Building upon these experiences, documenting lessons learned, and concertedly focusing on continuous improvement has resulted in a sound and relevant project design.

V EFFECTIVENESS

5.1 FINDINGS

5.1.1 Identification of Targeted Sectors and Worst Forms of Child Labor

Preliminary rapid field assessments (RFAs) were conducted by the implementing partners in June 2007 before signing the cooperative agreement in September, to determine the areas, significance, and types of child labor in northern Uganda. The RFAs confirmed the following forms of child labor and WFCL to be military service, commercial sexual exploitation, domestic work, brick making, agriculture, charcoal burning, and irregular unskilled labor. The project also used ORACLE and KURET data that ranked the primary forms of child labor as agriculture (28%), quarrying (18%), streets vending (16%), and domestic labor (8%).⁴⁸ Specifically, the project acknowledged the high prevalence of child labor in the Karamoja region—“the second highest reported rate of working children/child labor in the country (36.3% of children working and 17.9% involved in exploitive labor); however, specific data is lacking.”⁴⁹ The RFA in Moroto District also identified fetching water and selling local alcoholic brews. The RFA also identified issues of migration (i.e., out migration) and trafficking of children, especially girls, from rural to urban areas.

During the field visits, the evaluator confirmed the types of labor previously undertaken by the student beneficiaries. The predominant forms of labor mentioned by the interviewed students included quarrying, sand mining, agriculture, and domestic work. Hence, the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in their project strategy, and accurately identified WFCL in Uganda.

5.1.2 Identification and Selection of Targeted Schools

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology, combined with community mapping, was used by the project to identify and target communities and schools likely to have the highest prevalence of exploitive child labor and WFCL in the region. Experts from Ethiopia trained LEAP project staff on the use of the GIS and school mapping to maximize the number of children reached within specifically defined areas based on prevalence, need, and demand. The GIS technology was used to identify schools and communities within walking distance (five kilometers) from as many targeted children as possible. Hence, with the innovative GIS technology, and in cooperation with the DEOs, the decision was made to locate the LEAP project within 20 sub-counties of the five targeted districts. The DEOs of Moroto and Kitgum confirmed to the evaluator the use of the GIS and school/community mapping exercise and regarded it as an excellent means to identify beneficiary schools and communities.

⁴⁸ Project Document, September 2007, p. 14.

⁴⁹ Project Document, September 2007, p. 15.

5.1.3 Project Targets and Objectives

The LEAP project is on track to meet its targets for withdrawing and preventing 11,275 children at risk of, or involved in, exploitive labor. The aim of the project is to enroll 65% of beneficiaries by 2009. The rest of the enrollments will be conducted in 2010 (the third year of the project), with no enrollments taking place in the final year, 2011. At midterm, the project has enrolled 7,538 students (67% of the target and 2% more than the planned/expected enrollment). Pader District is slightly below the expected enrollment (63% instead of 65%). However, as it has a higher out-of-school population, its target was higher than Gulu District.⁵⁰ Kitgum District has exceeded its midpoint target by 12%.

Table 5: Total Enrollments by Education Interventions and Gender (to September 2009)

Education Intervention	Girls (50.5%)		Boys (49.5%)		Target		Total
	n	%	n	%	n	%	%
Primary	2,757	73%	2,687	72%	5,444	70%	72%
Secondary	764	20%	834	22%	1,598	20%	21%
Nonformal vocational	244	6%	192	5%	436	7%	6%
Apprenticeship	40	1%	20	1%	60	3%	1%
Total	3,805	100%	3,733	100%	7,538	100%	100%

The project's aim was to target 5,768 girls (51%).⁵¹ As of September 2009, the project has enrolled 50.5% girls and is on track to meet its targets (Table 5). However, apprenticeship enrollments are below targets for both males and females.⁵²

The aim of the project is to withdraw children from exploitive labor, targeted at 25%, and to prevent at-risk children from becoming involved in exploitive labor, targeted at 75%. At midterm, the project has withdrawn 1,903 students (25%) and prevented 5,635 students (75%), indicating that the project is on track to meet its targets (Table 6). In addition, the project has maintained a gender ratio of 50:50 within both categories: withdrawn and prevented. Through the project's data verification process conducted by the M&E staff every term in supported schools, LEAP project staff members closely track the status of beneficiaries to ensure that children are being withdrawn and prevented according to project and USDOL criteria.

⁵⁰ The enrollment target for the AVSI-supported districts was 45% to Gulu District and 55% to Pader District.

⁵¹ The 51% was derived from the total population of girls in the five districts: 1,006,460 girls from a general population of 1,969,635.

⁵² Statistics are from the September 2009 Technical Progress Report, and tables generated by the LEAP M&E advisor and district data clerks.

Table 6: Total Withdrawn and Prevented by Gender (to September 2009)

Year	Target			Actual								
	W	P	Total	W			P			Total		
				M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2008	533	1,738	2,271	217	316	533	881	857	1,738	1,098	1,173	2,271
2009	1,370	3,897	5,267	674	696	1,370	1,961	1,936	3,897	2,635	2,632	5,267
2010	922	2,815	3,737	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	2,825	8,450	11,275	891	1,012	1,903	2,842	2,793	5,635	3,733	3,805	7,538
%	25%	75%	100%	12%	13%	25%	38%	37%	75%	50%	50%	100%

Note: W = Withdrawn; P = Prevented; M = Male; F = Female; T = Total.

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT ACTION: EDUCATION INTERVENTIONS

Direct action interventions, such as withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL into relevant education programs—primary, secondary, nonformal vocational, and apprenticeship (alternative learning program)—have been effective in retaining students in schooling. Education interventions occurred in 31 primary schools, 24 secondary schools, 10 vocational institutions, 15 apprenticeship centers, and 4 PTCs. According to project status reports, data verification reports by project staff, random student files reviewed by the evaluator, stakeholder interviews, parent testimonies, and beneficiary interviews, these interventions have directly contributed to the positive well-being of beneficiaries. The interventions have also advanced beneficiaries' and the wider community's knowledge of the adverse effects of child labor. This knowledge includes being able to differentiate between child work and child labor, and attaches importance to children's education. As a result, these interventions subsequently led to the withdrawal or prevention of children from exploitive labor for LEAP project beneficiaries.

To date, there is an overall average persistence rate of 96%. All students are persisting in apprenticeship programs; 95% of girls and 85% of boys in vocational programs, 93% of girls and 98% of boys in secondary programs, and 97% for both girls and boys in primary school. The completers include 279 primary, 134 secondary, and 29 vocational students. Some of the primary students who completed have transitioned into secondary school. Secondary school completers have joined A-level (senior) secondary, while others have moved into nonformal vocational programs or dropped out completely. Specific statistics on the movement of primary and secondary completers are not provided. Vocational completers were provided startup kits and are continually being monitored during follow-up.

The dropout rate is currently 3%. The number is low because there are no dropouts from the apprenticeship program and only five boys from vocational programs. Of the dropouts, 65% are from primary school (55% girls and 45% boys) and 32% are from secondary school (82% girls and 18% boys). Hence, despite the government's UPE policy established in 1997, there is a high

dropout rate at primary level reflected in the LEAP project (66% of dropouts in government primary school according to the Government of Uganda, 2006).⁵³ The government notes no significant difference in the dropout rate between girls and boys at primary level. However, girls are more likely to drop out of school at secondary level.

5.2.1 Alternative Learning Program for Livelihoods: Apprenticeships

The apprenticeship program, also referred to as the Alternative Learning Program (ALP), currently has 60 enrollments due to difficulty in finding the artisans with which students are matched in order to learn practical on-the-job skills. The artisans have their own small businesses, such as hotels, tailoring shops, shoe-making businesses, or hair-dressing salons. The program ranges from six to nine months. ALP differs from vocational skills programs as the learning is more intensive and the apprentices work and learn at the same time, receiving appropriate motivational packages.⁵⁴ In vocational institutions, the courses are longer (nine months to two years) and combine theory and practice in a school environment (rather than in a business environment). The LEAP project has currently enrolled 436 students in vocational programs. Of the two programs, the apprentices appear to be learning more and therefore will be more prepared for employment. Because apprentices continually work with customers, they are likely to build a customer base to prepare them with a sound basis for commencing their own businesses. Some artisans have indicated to the evaluator that they will employ some apprentices after their training.

Apprenticeship activities are working well in Kitgum and Lira, as they are older, more stable, and more established districts. In Gulu District, the apprenticeship program has not yet started and the LEAP team together with the district has expressed interest in replicating what is happening in Kitgum District. It is currently not operating in Pader and Moroto districts due to the lack of artisans, predominantly due to the districts being newly established or having recently become more stable. Hence, the weakness in the apprenticeship approach is the availability, selection, and quality of artisans within a reasonable distance of the targeted students.

5.2.2 Vocational Training for Livelihoods

Vocational students undertake programs in a community-based center or recognized government institution to gain marketable employment skills. These include courses in brick making/laying and cement practices, tailoring, carpentry and joinery, motor vehicle maintenance, catering, and hair dressing. Functional literacy, book keeping, and business skills are also included in the training. Students interviewed by the evaluator expressed great enthusiasm for the opportunity to learn new skills and were confident that they would be employed after graduating—either within an existing business or in their own business. The evaluator discussed cooperatives with students and trainers, but this was not always a possibility in some areas due to the distance between students. After graduation, the LEAP project continues to follow up to determine whether they are employed and the level of success they are experiencing.

⁵³ Government of Uganda, Education Department. Available at http://www.education.go.ug/uganda_education_statistics.htm.

⁵⁴ Some centers give the apprentices lunches and small cash allowances due to funding from match funds.

The weakness in the provision of vocational training is selecting suitable vocational institutions. For example, the only vocational institute in Moroto District is a private organization with strict selection criteria that the LEAP project and its beneficiaries do not meet.

5.2.3 Primary Teachers' Colleges

To increase the number of teachers in schools, especially female teachers, the LEAP project supported 162 (93 females, 69 males) primary school teacher trainees in four PTCs. The trainee teachers in Kitgum PTC, Canon Lawrence PTC in Lira, and Moroto PTC were supported with tuition fees and scholastic materials, which aided them during academic work and teaching practice, while those in Gulu Core PTC received tuition fees, school uniforms, and scholastic materials. The rationale to support PTCs was not only the lack of teachers, specifically female teachers, as role models, but also the lack of teachers in Karamoja that were indigenous to the region. The project design states that only 30% of trainee teachers enrolled at the Moroto PTC are Karamojong, and only 30% are female. Therefore, while it was initially difficult to enroll girls who met the LEAP project selection criteria for support into the Moroto PTC (one female and 16 males enrolled in the first year), they eventually enrolled 12 females and 17 males.

The PTCs are also supported with stationery (paper) to conduct remedial lessons for improving the pass rates of trainee teachers in national examinations, and instructional materials to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. The inclusion of PTC trainee teachers into the LEAP project is therefore a proactive innovation for child labor projects and has been a critical element of the project's success.

5.3 EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES

5.3.1 Remedial Classes for Students

Remedial programs⁵⁵ for students were greatly appreciated by the DEOs and teachers of targeted schools, as well as parents. All stated that these programs ensured the retention and success of LEAP-supported students, and were extremely pleased that the support extended beyond LEAP beneficiaries. Students who are in LEAP-supported classes between P7 to S4 are offered remedial classes. The target of 1,100 by September 2009 has been significantly surpassed (by 199%). A total of 3,291 students have attended remedial/catch-up classes. Of the initial enrollment of 489 students, 98% have passed. Further research to track the impact of remedial classes could be considered.

5.3.2 Teacher Training

Teacher training, particularly in primary schools, and training to SMC and PTA members has been gratefully received by all stakeholders. This training has included guidance and counseling, the use of REPLICA materials and Supporting Children's Rights Through Education, the Arts, and the Media (SCREAM) modules (related to HIV/AIDS), school management, SMC training,

⁵⁵ The remedial program is also referred to as the Accelerated Learning Program.

cooperative learning, the design of low-cost and no-cost instructional materials, code of conduct, typewriter/duplicating machine use and maintenance, examination techniques, improving the quality of learning, and how to introduce the thematic curriculum. Teachers indicated to the evaluator that the most useful and effective training sessions were (1) guidance and counseling, (2) cooperative learning, and (3) low-cost and no-cost instructional material development.

Secondary teachers are yet to receive similar training in all topics. Teachers in a secondary school opposite a project-supported primary school were aware of the training provided and expressed a keen desire for the guidance and counseling training because, as one said, “We can notice the positive results.”

5.4 EFFECTIVENESS OF MODELS

5.4.1 Whole School Improvement Program

WSIP is intended to work with SMCs and PTAs to assess school improvement need in terms of learning quality and school safety for the ultimate benefit of children’s well-being and academic performance. Schools produce a School Development Plan, which is implemented with support from the LEAP project and community participation. The project also provided cupboards, textbooks, science equipment for secondary schools, office stationery, other teaching and learning aids, and in some cases duplicating machines and typewriters.

WSIP is a comprehensive approach to school improvement, including technical support, management guidance, training, awareness-raising on child labor and child protection issues, some classroom or structural rehabilitation (such as classrooms, dormitories, and laboratories), the provision of equipment and materials, encouragement of community participation models, and assistance to conduct the Primary Leaving Examinations.

5.4.2 Alternative Basic Education in Karamoja

The ABEK model,⁵⁶ a government initiative, is a nonformal program using the national curriculum with a flexible timetable to meet the needs of the nomadic herders in the region. Its coverage is limited and the instruction is given in the local language, while in formal schools the language of instruction is English. However, the ABEK model has been well-received by the DEO and students. The DEO suggested that LEAP project staff members in Moroto District support ABEK by mainstreaming children into relevant education programs. Hence, in the Karamoja region, the LEAP project has supported the mainstreaming of ABEK children by placing them in a direct education intervention in a formal school that has had training for teachers and administration. Alternative programs have limited effectiveness if they are standalone programs and are only effective if there are provisions for students to mainstream into formal schooling, or if they are provided with pathways to further education or employment.

⁵⁶ ABEK was initially supported by Save the Children (Norway).

5.4.3 Livelihoods for Families: Village Savings and Loans Associations

IRC's ERD sector documented their experiences in savings and lending schemes for parents, teachers, and communities, and in partnering with the LEAP project to pilot a program, which was submitted to the LEAP project team in January 2009. Therefore, from past experiences and lessons learned in previous USDOL-funded child labor projects, the LEAP project introduced the VSLAs. ERD provided the technical support to community-based trainers (CBT) to conduct the training for the VSLA groups and get them started in savings and loans activities.

VSLA members (about 30), predominantly women, are self-selecting but come from a project-supported community; whether they have project-supported children or not. To strengthen these associations, the LEAP project provides each group a toolkit after training consisting of a calculator, calendar, pens, stamp and pad, ink, passbooks, a ledger, a minute-writing book, and three padlocks for the metal cashbox, as well as regular follow-up, refresher training, and action audit.

VSLA members indicated to the evaluator that they used the loans to start small businesses, predominantly selling groceries at the market. They were excited about their progress and the demand by others in the community to form similar groups. Initially, LEAP established 12 groups and expanded to 20 in Kitgum District as a pilot. These groups, in addition to improving their individual financial situation, also established a kitty to fund community development projects. One group paid for extra electricity to the boys' school, while another group used the money to restore blackboards in the school by painting them, and another group supported the construction of a grass-thatched teachers' staff room. These community development projects added to the group members' self-esteem and sense of worth and respect within the community, while simultaneously benefiting school students and teachers.

ERD documented the challenges of introducing VSLAs, such as high demand and shortage of CBTs, theft of the cashboxes, the predominance of women, and the short savings period to realize high returns. It made recommendations to implement the program over 8 to 12 months so as to fully appreciate the returns on savings, provide technical and material support to new groups, and ensure more group vigilance toward cashbox security.

The LEAP project scaled up the VSLA to include Lira District, and at the project's midterm point has 57 groups supporting a total of 756 households.

5.4.4 Partnerships with Local Universities

The LEAP project design assumed that it would partner with several universities for research, infusion of child labor into coursework, policy formation, advocacy, and dissemination of lessons learned.⁵⁷ The project expected to partner with Kyambogo University and Makerere University. However, there were scheduling challenges with Makerere. In June 2009, Kyambogo University and the LEAP project collaborated to infuse child labor, life skills, gender, and child

⁵⁷ Project Document, September 2007, p. 62.

protection issues into the teacher training curriculum within the Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation. The *life skills* unit and the gender inclusion into the *gender, disability, and development* unit were completely new initiatives. The units on *conducive learning environments* and *guidance and counseling for persons with special needs* have been enhanced with a child labor and child protection focus. The revised curriculum for the Diploma in Special Needs Education is awaiting approval by the National Council for Higher Education. This is an excellent initiative at the national level to ensure that teachers of the diploma program acquire relevant skills pertaining to child labor.

Additionally, as a result of the collaboration, four second-year students (two females and two males) from the department of Development Studies conducted their practicum in Kitgum and Lira to gain firsthand experience in a region with a high prevalence of child labor.

5.5 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MONITORING SYSTEM

5.5.1 Child Labor Monitoring System

The CLMS used by the LEAP project utilizes a combination of procedures such as (1) a referral system; (2) community-based child labor monitoring; and (3) support of school inspectors, labor inspectors, probation and welfare officers, community officers, the DCLC, the Child Protection Committee (CPC), and the Child and Family Protection Unit.

The evaluator interviewed regional data clerks, observed computerized data entry, and inspected the filing systems within the IRC and AVSI offices. Filing cabinets were designated for the LEAP project with manila folders for each beneficiary containing referral, intake, and follow-up (monitoring) forms. The random files inspected were well kept and orderly. The evaluator also inspected student registers in each school, vocational institute, and PTC. Stakeholders commented that they monitor students according to specifications and checklists (sighted by the evaluator) provided by the LEAP project, and reported regularly on the progress. They also confirmed that they received regular visits by LEAP project staff.

The data clerks were requested to provide sample printouts of project data and statistics. Overall, the data clerks and M&E staff at the head office provided an effective monitoring system and database to track and monitor student beneficiaries.

Work Status on Weekends and School Holidays

A current weakness of the project is the monitoring of beneficiaries on weekends and during school holidays. The evaluator witnessed beneficiary children working on the weekend in a garden and stone quarry. When questioned and during interviews, the children did not identify the weekend work as child labor because it did not interfere with their schooling. Some students indicated that they would not relapse into exploitive work but said that they worked on weekends and vacation, especially children of child-headed families. While the distinction between child work and child labor could be articulated by students, in theory there continues to be blurred boundaries. Parents further accepted the activity due to their economic situation. Hence, closer

monitoring of students on weekends and vacations is required to determine the extent and number of hours children are working.

Work Status and Working Hours

The intake and follow-up forms have been designed to capture extensive information on beneficiaries, including information on work status and working hours. However, the current policy on follow-up forms is *not* to capture working hours *if* the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) status in Question 8a is checked as *withdrawn* or *prevented*. Only forms that were checked *not yet* proceeded to Question 8c, which recorded the number of days worked per week, the number of hours worked per day, and whether the child still works for pay, no pay, or in-kind. All the follow-up forms seen by the evaluator did not proceed to Question 8c, and therefore did not capture the working hours.

It is essential to record the number of days worked per week, the number of hours worked per day, and whether the child still works for pay, no pay, or in-kind on both the intake form and the follow-up form (regardless of GPRA status). This would more accurately determine the exact number of working hours per day every six months during the follow-up. In terms of recording and producing statistics, it would then match with the information on the intake forms for comparison between the number of hours worked at enrollment and the number of hours worked during follow-up. This is essential information to facilitate any guidance or counseling if the number of hours worked is increasing or remaining the same, and it would provide evidence of success if the number of hours worked is decreasing. Hence, it is recommended that during all future follow-ups, LEAP project staff ensure that Question 8c is answered by all beneficiaries regardless of whether they have been withdrawn, prevented, or not yet withdrawn/prevented.

Currently, the only information that the evaluator could determine for comparison purposes from intake to follow-up was the work status (such as light work, regular work, and hazardous work) in two districts, Gulu and Pader, due to the persistence of the Gulu data clerk who was able to produce a student-by-student list from Cohort 1 (2008 enrollments). From this list, the evaluator could determine the following results (Table 7).

Table 7: Work Status of Beneficiaries in Gulu and Pader Districts

Status	Gulu	Pader	Total
Same	65%	54%	59%
Reduced	22%	43%	33%
Increased	13%	3%	8%

Table 7 indicates that 59% of the beneficiaries surveyed recorded no change to their work status during the period between their intake and follow-up (this was regular work to regular work), while 33% recorded a decrease (either hazardous work to regular work, or regular work to light work), and 8% recorded an increase (light work to regular work). For a more accurate record, it is recommended that LEAP project staff ensure that the information on intake and follow-up forms is entered into the regional databases and that the statistics are forwarded to the M&E advisor in Kampala in a format whereby numbers and percentages can be tabled. This would

facilitate further counseling of beneficiaries where necessary, and provide further supporting evidence of success if students are reducing their work status, particularly from hazardous to regular or light work. Coupled with information on working hours, this would provide essential and useful information to the LEAP project team.

Hence, it is recommended that working hours are captured for each beneficiary during intake and every follow-up, and that information for both work status and working hours are able to be reproduced in table form for reporting. This process could be provided as action research and disseminated to stakeholders.

5.5.2 Monitoring of Mobile Populations

Families in northern Uganda have been, and continue to be, highly mobile as they move from internally displaced camps back to their homelands. Therefore, the tracking and monitoring of the highly mobile student beneficiaries has proven to be a challenge addressed by the project. The project implements a two-point strategy to track and monitor students: (1) regular follow-up of all beneficiaries (every six months) and (2) a verification process (every term).

The verification process involves collecting the list of beneficiaries for each targeted school, then LEAP project staff or community mobilizers go class to class to conduct a roll call. Absent students are noted and classmates are asked about the movements of the absentees. If a child is still within the area, they are counseled to return to school. If absent students have transferred to another project-supported school nearby, the staff members or mobilizers confirm their enrollment with the school administration (these students remain on the LEAP project register and undergo continued follow-up). If absentee students have transferred to a non-project-supported school, they are considered to be dropouts from the LEAP project; however, it is noted that they have not dropped out of school.

The verification process also checks and confirms beneficiaries' age, class, school attendance, knowledge of child labor, and their knowledge of how they were selected for the LEAP project; it also conducts a check of the regional office filing systems, completion of forms, and meetings with women's groups, child protection committees, and/or community-based child labor monitors. Hence, the project successfully monitors the highly mobile student beneficiaries through a comprehensive and rigorous process.

5.6 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

5.6.1 Management Strengths and Weaknesses

The LEAP project management team in Kampala includes the project director, M&E advisor, education advisor, and program coordinator, who are all IRC staff. The AVSI area team leader, based in Gulu, also complements the management team. In addition, each of the five operational districts is headed by a program manager. The management strengths include (1) cohesion toward a common goal due to clear and strong leadership and direction; (2) continuous reflection and refinement of strategies and activities; and (3) extensive documentation of processes, procedures, decisions, and shifts in strategies.

The management areas that need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives include (1) information sharing across districts (for staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries); (2) instigation of action research to document models, strategies, and effective programs (such as WSIP, CLMS, ALP) to analyze best practices; and (3) producing research and statistical evidence of the work status and hours worked of beneficiaries to support the technical progress report process to USDOL, match fund donors, and stakeholders.

Implementation Challenges

Implementation challenges continue in the Karamoja region in terms of livelihoods provisions (such as VSLA, vocational training, and apprenticeships). These challenges have specifically included delays in establishing VSLAs due to piloting the activity in other districts first (currently there are no VSLAs in the Karamoja region), the lack of vocational training institutes with the flexibility to accept LEAP project beneficiaries, and the difficulty in identifying suitable quality artisans for the apprenticeship activities (and gaining community support). These challenges have been clearly identified by the project's management team who continue to explore solutions. Discussions have indicated that they may be able to introduce VSLAs in the Karamoja region in 2010.

The main delays have been in the livelihood component, action research, and some training to secondary teachers. Planning is currently underway by the project team to address these delays. The delay to apprenticeships and nonformal vocational education enrollments is largely due to limited resources and institutions in the regions. The delay to implement action research is mainly due to the scheduling of partners. Training planned for 2010 will address whole school improvement with head teachers in school management; secondary teachers will receive training in the same topics provided to primary teachers. During discussions with secondary teachers, they had not yet received guidance and counseling training, which they were keen to receive because they identified it as critical and extremely beneficial for students as well as for teachers (both groups being in need of psychosocial support). The delay to secondary teacher training is due to the activity being funded by match funds. Two grants have only recently been received to fund part of the training, and the project team is currently seeking additional match funding.

Another implementation challenge is the duration of support limited to two years, and the phasing in of cost sharing to parents. This is currently being piloted in Moroto District and efforts appear to be positive. However, many parents (and stakeholders) indicated to the evaluator that it would be difficult to implement in their school or sub-county. There is an underlying concern that students will relapse into exploitive labor if parents can't afford to participate in cost sharing. Hence, it is recommended that the implementation of cost sharing is carefully and closely monitored and documented during its pilot phase.

5.7 IMPLEMENTATION: LESSONS LEARNED

5.7.1 Work Status on Weekends and School Holidays

It is important to monitor children's work on weekends and school holidays to ensure that they are not relapsing into exploitive work, long work hours, or work that affects their access to education.

5.7.2 Working Hours

The hours worked by a child targeted for support should be recorded on intake forms and during each follow-up to monitor the extent to which the working hours have reduced, as the information can be used to provide an indicator of an individual beneficiary's progress and project success.

5.8 IMPLEMENTATION: BEST PRACTICES

5.8.1 GIS and School/Community Mapping

The project built upon existing technology and expertise in school mapping to identify and select schools and communities with the highest prevalence of exploitive labor and WFCL for LEAP project support. The beneficiaries are therefore close (within walking distance) to an educational institution. For example, targeted schools are close to child labor sites (such as rock quarries) within the community, and hence withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL and placing them in appropriate educational interventions has become manageable in terms of monitoring students and providing the most needed communities with support. The innovative GIS technology, adapted for this use by IRC in Ethiopia, assisted in maximizing the number of children reached in specifically defined areas.

5.8.2 Monitoring of Mobile Beneficiaries

The community-based CLMS has proven to be effective due to the high rate of community support and their local knowledge of students and their backgrounds. It is conducive to effective monitoring because students who are absent from school can be visited and counseled more readily. It is also conducive for tracking mobile students as the community is generally well informed about the movement of families. In addition, the verification process provides a comprehensive check of schools and beneficiaries through confirmation of age, class, attendance, knowledge of child labor, student performance, and progress of school committees and community-based child labor monitors.

5.8.3 Remedial Classes for P7–S4

The provision of remedial classes to project-supported students and students in project-supported classes, from P7 to S4, provides an additional incentive to retain students in school and to ensure their success/completion.

5.8.4 Whole School Improvement Program

WSIP is a comprehensive approach to school improvement that includes technical support, management guidance, training, awareness-raising on child labor and child protection issues, some classroom or structural rehabilitation (such as latrines), and the provision of equipment and materials. Its focus on quality education also includes community and student participation, where the activities are for the ultimate benefit of all students.

5.8.5 Village Savings and Loans Associations

VSLAs provide an avenue for community members within the project-supported area to work together for individual and community financial gain. Loans are used to start small businesses—predominantly selling groceries at the market. A kitty is formed where every member contributes a small amount of money to fund community development projects, such as restoring blackboards or constructing a teachers' staff room. These community development projects add to the group members' self-esteem and sense of worth and respect within the community, while simultaneously benefiting school students and teachers.

5.8.6 Infusion of Child Labor in University Coursework

Collaborating with a local university to infuse child labor, life skills, gender, and child protection issues into the teacher training curriculum is an excellent initiative at the national level to ensure that teachers acquire relevant skills pertaining to child labor that they can impart to students and communities.

5.8.7 Inclusivity and Special Needs

An impressive element of the LEAP project is its attention to the government's Inclusive Education policy to provide education for all, thus inclusive of people with special needs. This is not only reflected in the collaboration with Kyambogo University's Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation, but also in the extensive involvement with committees supporting adults and children with special needs, and the inclusion of children with special needs into the LEAP project. The evaluator spoke with a deaf student supported by the LEAP project who was fully involved in subjects, school clubs, and activities.

VI EFFICIENCY

6.1 FINDINGS

USDOL provided a grant of US\$5,499,997 for the LEAP project, with an expectation of US\$634,055 matching funds from external donors to be sought by the project. To date, the project has attracted matching funds of US\$1,100,000, exceeding the target by 73%.⁵⁸ At the time of the evaluation, additional matching funds were being negotiated and finalized for the remaining two years of the project.

6.1.1 Cost-Efficiency

The project has had severe financial constraints placed upon it due to the initial budget inadequately accounting for the cost of its livelihoods component. Funding educational interventions for livelihoods such as vocational training and apprenticeships have a higher cost-per-student ratio than the provision of support for primary and secondary schooling, and this may not have been factored into the initial budget. The result of this is that the LEAP project has had to solve the situation using creative and imaginative means, as well as scaling down all activities to serving basically a monitoring phase in the final fourth year. Enrollments will meet the target of 11,275 but have been reduced to three cohorts: 2008 (Year 1), 2009 (Year 2), and 2010 (Year 3). In addition, all activities have had careful and regular strategizing to monitor progress and impact. For example, pilot programs have been conducted for some activities to gauge their success or otherwise before determining whether they should be scaled up. Other IRC and AVSI divisions and sectors, such as IRC's ERD sector and AVSI's SPRING program, have been used to partner with the LEAP project's activities and provide technical support, and often financial support. Existing training materials and modules have been used from programs such as USAID-supported UNITY, UPHOLD, and REPLICA to ensure cost-efficiency. The evaluator found that the management staff worked closely with the regional office staff to openly address the funding situation, and every project member has worked as a team for the effective and efficient use of resources to resolve implementation issues pertaining to budget implications.

6.1.2 Project Strategies: Human Resources

The LEAP project structure, in terms of human resources, is (1) a project director; (2) four high-level managers (program manager, M&E advisor, education advisor, and program coordinator at the national level); (3) two assistant program managers and three education managers, an awareness-raising manager, and an M&E manager at the regional office level; and (4) five data clerks, six education officers/project officers, and eight education assistants/assistant project officers. With a total staffing level of 31 people, 26 people work at the regional level to cover five districts. Hence, the team is lean and depends on the assistance of community mobilizers (on the payroll), as well as the involvement of coordinating center tutors, district government staff, committees, and school and community members to assist with the monitoring process.

⁵⁸ Table 8 in the Sustainability section provides a list of external donors and the amount sponsored.

6.1.3 Monitoring and Reporting Systems

The monitoring team comprises an M&E advisor at the national LEAP project office in Kampala, an M&E/field manager based in Lira, and five data clerks based in each of the five operational districts. The CLMS was adopted and modified from the previous USDOL-funded child labor project in northern Uganda and East Africa, KURET. In addition, the monitoring and tracking database built upon the database used in the USDOL-funded Combating Youth and Child Labor Through Education child labor project in Liberia and Sierra Leone.

KURET's comprehensive community-based CLMS had its own challenges. The goal to monitor every child on a regular basis (at least every six months) resulted in transport, staffing, documentation, and time-related challenges. The LEAP project has learned from these challenges, which is why they used the GIS system to target schools within five kilometers of students' homes and therefore within walking distance (thereby reducing pressure on the project to provide transport for students). The lessons learned from the KURET CLMS also resulted in the LEAP project limiting the number of sub-counties to a manageable number. This was conducted in conjunction and with the support of the DEOs, which also monitor child labor through CPCs and DCLCs.

Interviews with the DEO of each district confirmed that the CLMS was efficient in combining lessons learned with the use of existing government and community structures, and in the provision of joint monitoring of child labor in the region. Therefore, the CLMS meets the needs and requirements of the project, as do the DEOs.

Challenge to Child Labor Monitoring System

A challenge to the CLMS in the district is the lack of labor officers. In the Kitgum Town Council there is no district labor officer, and in Pader District a district labor officer has recently been appointed. There are limited government labor officers⁵⁹ to adequately visit workplaces and child labor sites, such as stone quarries. To combat this lack, the DEO staff members often visit child labor sites as part of their duties, as does the district Probation and Welfare Office staff. This issue is a government issue and is outside the scope of the LEAP project. However, the districts are highly committed to monitoring and combating child labor despite the inadequate provision of labor officers.

6.2 EFFICIENCY: BEST PRACTICES

6.2.1 Pilot Programs

Piloting programs has been used extensively by the LEAP project. For example, the introduction of VSLAs was piloted in Kitgum District, commencing in July 2008. The successes of the VSLAs include cumulative savings, cumulative loans, the use of loans to start small businesses for income generation, support to communities through a kitty of funds—used, for example, to

⁵⁹ Labor officers work within MGLSD.

pay for more power/electricity to their children's school—thus resulting in a tightly bonded group with a sense of purpose and pride. Hence, VSLAs have been scaled up in Lira, with other districts planned.

Working with ILO, the LEAP project also piloted/pre-tested the introduction of their SCREAM module—Child Labor in Conflict and Post-Conflict Situations—in Lira District, particularly involving girls with low self-esteem and boys involved in criminal, antisocial, or drug-related activities. Hence, the use of pilots is an excellent, cost-efficient way to test an innovative activity or model before implementing it on a larger scale, and it is also a way to make continuous shifts and amendments.

VII IMPACT

7.1 IMPACT ON LIVELIHOODS

At the midterm of the project, it is too early to accurately determine the impact on livelihoods. However, mothers of vocational students, interviewed by the evaluator, indicated that they were proud of their children's new abilities, their "reborn" confidence, the prospect of being financially independent, and the "inevitability" that they will be role models for their brothers and sisters. Apprenticeship students in Kitgum District confirmed their "new status" among their families and added that "it is a dream to have this opportunity to make a change in my life."

7.2 IMPACT ON EDUCATION QUALITY

7.2.1 Individual Beneficiaries

Individual students expressed a "love of learning" and were enthusiastic about being in class. Some students said that they had made new friends and were "happier" than before they were enrolled in school. A group of girls in a secondary school said that having uniforms "made them feel important" and that they "fit in with other students of the school." They confirmed that teachers were not using corporal punishment with a cane or stick, except in one primary school in Moroto District where students said that "teachers use the stick if we are very, very naughty" and added that it did not happen often. Teachers expressed gratitude for their training, particularly cooperative learning, guidance and counseling, and the management of large classrooms, which introduces alternative forms of discipline. The number of school teachers has not increased despite the additional enrollments; hence, class sizes are large and there are inadequate classrooms. Therefore, training them in managing large classrooms is critical—for managing discipline and providing quality teaching. In fact, the evaluator noted in a girls' secondary school that two students were sitting on the ground outside the classroom as "punishment" for disrupting the class.

Students indicated that they had received scholastic support, including uniforms, school bags, and stationery. One student said that the school bags were too small, especially for secondary students. Others said that they wanted shoes because their uniforms "look smart" but "would be smarter with shoes." Teachers, LEAP project staff, and other stakeholders commented that if students received shoes, they would only wear them to church. However, the evaluator witnessed students wearing their uniforms on weekends because they possibly had limited clothing.

LEAP project support also included examination fees. When the evaluator observed the academic records, most of the students were passing their subjects. Students now aspired to careers as pilots, teachers, lawyers, priests, and accountants. Parents indicated that when their children were employed in exploitive work, they did not dream of careers "like that" but only dreamed of "having money" to buy food and support the family. When asked why they were supported by the program, some students did not know, but said that it was because they were poor. Others articulately expressed the procedure for being selected, particularly secondary students. However, one secondary girl said she lied to the LEAP project staff when she said she

was collecting firewood, but admitted to the evaluator that she was engaged in commercial sexual activities and thought she would not be accepted into the project if she told the truth. She realizes now that the LEAP project mobilizers were there to help her; she said she heard that another school had a counseling room and she thought that was a good idea “for people like me.”

7.2.2 Schools

During the field visit, stakeholders confirmed that the impact of the LEAP project on education quality, to date, included (1) an increase in enrollment; (2) supply of materials, such as science equipment, that they did not previously have; (3) improvement of student performance through remedial lessons; (4) support to the music, dance, and drama clubs; (5) sensitizing the community to child labor and the importance of education; and (6) easier monitoring of students (especially due to the follow-ups). Head teachers understood that resources were limited for school rehabilitation and thought that community participation, through the work and “word” of the SMCs and PTAs, was beneficial “for everyone.”

7.3 IMPACT ON CHILD PROTECTION AND CHILD LABOR

7.3.1 Awareness-Raising

The main impact, to date, of the awareness-raising and sensitization of parents and community groups is the importance of education, the return of children to school, and the heightening of child protection issues. Awareness has been raised through campaigns, radio programs, advocacy messages, and special days such as the World Day Against Child Labor. The evaluator witnessed the Gulu Walk on October 24, 2009 commemorating the “night commuters”—the children in northern Uganda who had to resort to walking every night to Gulu for safety. This year’s theme for the Gulu Walk was “Child Protection: A Culture of Peace,” and not only did the LEAP project team take part, but they were instrumental in raising awareness through the provision of a marquis, signs in public places around Gulu, a banner, facilitating project-supported school beneficiaries to participate through music and dance, and the provision of commemorative T-shirts. Other awareness-raising activities at the local level include radio programs and spot messages, community sensitization meetings (to date 18,779 members have participated),⁶⁰ the establishment of 18 women and youth groups that conduct awareness-raising in the community, and school clubs (through music, dance, and drama).

Awareness-raising was also conducted at the national level through the development of instructional education communication (IEC) materials such as desk calendars, T-shirts, banners, art competitions, and branded scholastic materials; policy dialogue at ministerial level; participation in child labor and child protection committees; media messages; brochures and posters; press releases; and dramas, poems, and songs.

Stakeholders, including NGOs, stated that there is greater cohesion and coordination in all levels of the community toward child protection activities and strategies. Another impact is the

⁶⁰ LEAP Project Summary, October 17, 2009, p. 7.

awareness of the difference between child work and child labor, for easier identification of exploitive labor and WFCL in order to address them in the community and district. In addition, the LEAP project and the DEO are making progress toward safe school strategies that ensure improved sanitation (such as latrines), hygiene (encouraging students to wash hands after using the latrines), the rehabilitation of schools to ensure safety, the appointment of at least two female teachers in each primary school, and the appointment of school counselors where possible.

7.3.2 School Clubs

The LEAP project strengthened the existing school and youth clubs to energize them; train them on child labor, child rights, and child protection issues; and motivate them through music, dance, and drama. The evaluator had previously observed school clubs during the KURET final evaluation with disappointing results—students were not keen or motivated, they were under pressure from their parents to go straight home from school to help with housework, they were not overtly knowledgeable of child labor issues, were not strong or active in community advocacy and sensitization, and they believed that the clubs would disband after the KURET program finished.

The LEAP project team has learned from these lessons and has reinvigorated the school clubs to the point where students are keen, motivated, vocal on child rights and protection issues, active in the community (providing the evaluator with examples of their campaign involvement), and now strongly believe that they can “carry on the voice of the LEAP project.” The evaluator was impressed with the confidence and articulation of all students, especially girls, in debating issues of child labor. When the evaluator discussed this with DEO officials, the reasons for the success of the school clubs were noted as follows: (1) a teacher is attached to the clubs to be a role model, to be a motivator, and to provide direction; (2) there is constant communication with parents on the activities of the clubs, so that parents know what their children are doing; (3) the activities and membership of the clubs is viewed, by teachers and students, as an important and expected part of the school core curriculum; (4) the clubs build upon the interests of the students; and (5) the activities are well planned and supported by the DEO.

7.3.3 Government

Government officials at the district level, particularly within the education and labor ministries, are committed, serious, and active in their efforts to combat child labor. They particularly take the sustainability plans discussed with LEAP project staff seriously and intend to continue many activities. At the national level, MOES and MGLSD have collaborated with various stakeholders, including LEAP project staff, to progress policy reform and foster the infusion of child labor awareness into the primary curriculum through the National Curriculum Development Center (NCDC).

District Ordinances

At the district level, the LEAP project has worked with District Councils to progress ordinances in Gulu, Lira, Pader, and Kitgum. In Lira District in 2009, the local government developed a child protection ordinance that includes paragraphs on “harmful employment,” “aiding street

children,” “corporal punishment prohibited,” “places of entertainment not to admit children,” and “advertisers not to employ children.” The ordinance includes offences and punishments. The evaluator sighted an invitation by the Gulu District Local Government to AVSI on October 22, 2009 to discuss the draft ordinance seeking to “promote girl child education in the district.” The draft ordinance on quality assurance in education includes statements such as “Every school has at least two female teachers” and a full section on child labor mitigation strategies. The section on the promotion of girls’ education includes early marriages, pregnancy, domestic chores, and sanitary facilities. Pader District is developing an education and gender ordinance. These ordinances will be submitted to the attorney general and it is expected that they will be in force by the end of 2009. District Councils were proud of their progress in child labor, education, and child protection issues, which they believe will considerably advance the sustainability of enforcement measures to combat child labor and put in place instruments for positive change.

Policy Support

At the national level, the government has taken a number of measures to progress child labor policies and strategies. The LEAP project staff is involved in these measures through attendance at committee meetings and other avenues for cooperation. This includes, as part of the Technical Working Group, the development of the Popular Version of the NCLP, which simplifies the policy for implementation at the local level. This is at the third draft stage, as of September 2009, and is expected to be finalized by the end of the year. The LEAP project has also been involved in advancing the list of hazardous work developed by MGLSD’s Child Labor Unit⁶¹ and the National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor. The government is also moving forward, with ILO, to finalize the National Employment Policy. The formulation of the Education Blue Print is another area of collaboration in which the policy outlines the priority needs for northern Uganda.

The National Council for Children (NCC) lists the joint activities with the LEAP project as the following: (1) development of IEC materials including the calendar and child advocacy planner for 2009; (2) development of draft awareness-raising and life skills manuals for children and youth; (3) development of a national sustainability plan to sustain some of the project’s interventions; (4) attendance at coordination meetings; (5) membership of the national child participation forum; (6) planning and organization of national and international events (such as World Day Against Child Labor, and the Day of the African Child); (7) facilitation of a national art competition entitled “Give Girls a Chance”; and (8) general information sharing on children’s issues on a regular and continuous basis.

Expected future work between the LEAP project and the government at the national level includes (1) advocacy; (2) livelihoods activities; (3) sharing information such as lessons learned and current successes; (4) capacity building; (5) advancing work with the child labor participation forum; and (6) continued planning and organization of special events and international child labor days.

⁶¹ The list of hazardous work is still at draft stage but close to finalization.

Infusion into the Primary Curriculum

The LEAP project has been working with the NCDC for the infusion of child labor and life skills into the thematic curriculum for P4–P7 primary classes. This is currently in draft form. The thematic curriculum incorporates all subjects and trains pre-service and in-service teachers on innovative classroom practices. NCDC confirms that it had “traces” of information on child labor and life skills in the curriculum but they were “not well grounded and needed orientation.” With the LEAP project’s involvement, they worked on translating the ideas into learning situations. NCDC thought that the project’s involvement was limited due to funding constraints and hoped for further support. The curriculum will be implemented in 2010 and expects further collaboration with the LEAP project on the training for implementation as well as monitoring the implementation in the field, “because the support will not be complete without training.”

Infusion of child labor and life skills in the secondary curriculum is yet to be achieved. This is more complicated and more expensive than the primary curriculum infusion due to the requirement of subject specialists and the difficulty in timetabling meetings.

International Labour Organization

The LEAP project is participating with ILO in revising the NCLP into a popular version, which began in July 2009. In 2010, the project will continue to participate in finalizing the document and will conduct pilot testing of its implementation in Lira District. After pilot testing, the project will also support the rollout of the popular version to the communities in their five operational districts. ILO also indicates that the LEAP project is involved in the advancement of the National Action Plan, as well as national awareness-raising campaigns. The LEAP project also invited ILO members to a sustainability workshop and are continuously involved in discussions with ILO regarding child labor issues.

ILO-IPEC implements the USDOL-funded SNAP project. The difference between the SNAP and LEAP projects is that the latter works directly with district officials and schools, whereas ILO works with a middle layer (i.e., NGOs that work with the districts and schools). Another difference is that the LEAP project works predominantly with MOES, and ILO works predominantly with MGLSD. The idea of using artisans for apprentices was initiated by the LEAP project and is an approach considered by ILO for implementation. ILO is also considering adopting other LEAP project initiatives such as WSIP because ILO likes its flexibility and holistic approach. Hence, ILO would advocate for exchange visits for stakeholders, teachers, and students from their operational areas with those from the LEAP project’s operational areas for information sharing and networking.

ILO and the LEAP project are currently planning action research on disabilities with respect to child labor and are yet to schedule its implementation into the combined operational districts. ILO has a disabilities department that will draft the Terms of Reference. ILO is also planning a joint information-sharing session for early next year, possibly February or March 2010. Hence, the LEAP project’s working relationship with ILO is mutual, cooperative, extensive, regular, and productive.

7.4 EMERGING ISSUES

The following issues may emerge during the remaining two years of the project's implementation; they may require consideration and response, or may impact the project's outcomes.

7.4.1 Orphans and Vulnerable Children

There is a current national debate on streamlining ministerial departments, units, committees, policies, and other structures that pertain to OVC, child labor, child protection, child trafficking, and youth. The debate centers on uniformity, synergies, and effectiveness of areas that are focusing on similar or equivalent issues. The debate also considers that child labor fits as a subcomponent of OVC.⁶² Part of the solution may be to restructure departments; another solution may be to have subcommittees or working groups under a single umbrella department. The Child Labor Unit remains uncertain as to how any restructuring would affect its operations and functions. The major concern is not to dissipate the issues of child labor under the weight of other “competing” or “higher-order” issues. Any restructuring or streamlining within MGLSD is not expected to impact the LEAP project, as project staff members are open-minded and work within government structures; however, it may consume time and effort as the LEAP project would be considered a major actor in the debate.

At the district level, the District Councils decide how they restructure or continue with CPCs, DCLCs, or Community Child Labor Committees. The LEAP project recognizes this and would work within any local government structure.

7.4.2 District Divisions

Originally there were 21 districts in Uganda. There are currently 101 districts.⁶³ As each district splits and previous counties become districts, the newly created district may require extra staffing. Some new districts may not need additional staff if some shift from the “mother” district or if some structures are shared. New districts and their town councils may require additional councilors, district administration headquarters, and other departmental structures. The rationale for the “split” is that the creation of a new district moves government services closer to the people, thus reducing conflict. However, there are financial and resource implications. Pader District was newly created in 2003 and continues to have limited resources. Additionally, some officials do not live in the district but commute each week, thus they are seen to be disconnected from their working district. Over the next two years of the project, the creation of new districts within the project's operational areas is a possibility. There is currently discussion that Kitgum District will split again in July 2010. This may impact working relationships at the district level (a change of staff) and place constraints on the new district's resources.

⁶² OVCs are generally children of 0 to 18 years, and children under child labor policies are generally 5 to 17 years.

⁶³ L. K. Abimanyi, Uganda's districts grow beyond size, *Daily Monitor*, November 18, 2009.

7.4.3 Impending Elections

Uganda will hold the next general election in 2011—the second election under a multiparty democracy. In a statement signed by U.S. Ambassador Martin Shearman, the donor consortium encourages the Government of Uganda’s respect for human rights, such as the right of free assembly, free expression, and the freedom of the media, through acceptance of the renewed Public Order Act.⁶⁴ Uganda’s Supreme Court identified a number of concerns during the previous 2006 election, including bribery, intimidation, multiple voting, and vote stuffing in some areas. The Supreme Court also expressed concern about the inadequacy of voter education. Hence, the project may need to be prepared for any potential dissent and conflict in areas that may impact on the implementation of its activities. In particular, schools and teachers may be involved in voter education and the election process, which may disrupt the schooling of the beneficiaries.

In addition, Southern Sudan will hold an independence referendum by March 2011 on whether or not it should remain part of Sudan, as part of the 2005 Naivasha Cooperative Peace Agreement (CPA) between the Khartoum Central Government and the Sudan People’s Liberation Army. Simultaneously, referendums will be held in Abyei, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile (border regions between the north and the south) on whether to become part of Southern Sudan or part of (Khartoum’s northern) Sudan. The recent controversial population census in 2008 is the prerequisite for the voter registration process for the national elections in 2010, which will set the stage for the referendum. The proposed date for the independence referendum is January 3 to January 5, 2011. The CPA paved the way for peace in northern Uganda and started the movement of internally displaced persons out of the camps and into their homelands. Disputes during the national election and the referendum may impact on areas in northern Uganda toward the border with Sudan and the Sudanese who are now living in Uganda.

7.5 IMPACT: LESSONS LEARNED

7.5.1 School Clubs

School clubs, with activities related to combating child labor, are more active and successful if (1) a teacher is attached to the clubs to be a role model, to be a motivator, and to provide direction; (2) there is constant communication with parents on the activities of the clubs, so that parents know what their children are doing; (3) the activities and membership of the clubs are viewed by teachers and students as an important and expected part of the school core curriculum; (4) the clubs build upon the interests of the students; and (5) the activities are well planned and supported by the DEO.

⁶⁴ The Partners for Democracy and Good Governance Group brings together the ambassadors and heads of mission of Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, the European Commission, and the United Nations.

7.6 IMPACT: BEST PRACTICES

7.6.1 District Ordinances

The development of district ordinances and sub-county bylaws in child labor, education, and child protection issues can considerably advance the sustainability of enforcement measures to combat child labor and put in place instruments for positive change.

7.6.2 Infusion of Child Labor into the Primary Curriculum

The infusion of child labor and life skills into the primary curriculum at the national level enables extremely wide coverage and awareness-raising to teachers, students, and the school community.

VIII SUSTAINABILITY

8.1 FINDINGS

8.1.1 Exit Strategy

The LEAP project has an exit/phase-out strategy and sustainability plan for the project, and has initiated parallel plans at each regional/district LEAP project office, as well as with DEO offices. These were developed in the early stages of the project, and discussed with partners, government stakeholders, and schools to prepare them to take over responsibilities and/or activities to the degree in which they are capable. To ensure sustainability, the LEAP processes have included the following measures:

- Facilitation, development, or support of policies (ordinances, national laws and regulations, and the NCLP).
- Institutional capacity building, awareness, and support (line ministries, curriculum infusion, schools, and district offices).
- Processes (WSIP, teacher training, resource mobilization, referral mechanism, school enrollment procedures, school supervision and monitoring, and the CLMS).
- Continued support of existing structures (national child labor unit, national child labor steering committee, NCC, CPCs, child labor committees, SMCs, PTAs, school clubs, GEM clubs, VSLAs, and women's groups).

8.1.2 Leveraging Non-Project Resources

The project has been successful in leveraging non-project resources through match funding, and there is the potential for sustainable funding. Currently, of the 2,633 girls enrolled in the LEAP project, 1,658 are supported by match funding from the General Electric Foundation and 248 are supported by Harris MyCFO Foundation in Lira and Kitgum districts. In addition, these two match funds are used support the livelihoods component (VSLA, apprenticeship, and trade startup toolkit) as well the WSIP, focusing on renovating school facilities and capacity building.

The current match funds are as indicated in Table 8.

Table 8: LEAP Match Funds

Donor	Amount	Duration	Target
General Electric (GE) Foundation	US\$1,000,000	February 1, 2008 to January 31, 2011	Education of girls
Harris MyCFO Foundation	US\$100,000	November 7, 2008 to November 7, 2009	Promoting girls' education
Mr. Simonelli (GE staff)	US\$12,000	January to December 2009	Monitoring and quality assurance

Recent efforts (during the evaluation) have produced the following results: the Oak Foundation will provide about US\$350,000 to strengthen the livelihoods and child protection components, commencing in November 2009 for 18 months. The target is Kitgum District only. The Harris MyCFO Foundation initial funding for one year has finished, although an extension of another US\$100,000 is likely (due to positive discussions at the end of October 2009) and will cover livelihoods and child protection in Lira District for 12 months. Funding has also been sought from a private U.S. donor and a potential U.K. donor.

8.1.3 Partnership Challenges

Both implementing partners, IRC and AVSI, have achieved success in initiating and maintaining partnerships within their operational areas, and have developed strong relationships and coordination mechanisms with the various stakeholders involved in child labor and related child welfare and education programs and activities, including NGOs, community groups, government committees, and other donor agencies.

In the LEAP project operational areas of Kitgum, Lira, and Moroto, some of IRC's stakeholders include Save the Children Uganda in Moroto District to support students in the ABEK program who will be mainstreamed into formal education, and the Save the Children's Quality Education Project to provide teacher training on alternative disciplinary methods and cooperative learning. It partners on early childhood development for children 0 to 5 years on health and nutrition, growth monitoring, play, and early stimulation in order to prepare them for formal schooling or ABEK enrollment. IRC participates in the Education Sector Working Group, the Livelihoods and Food Security Working Group, the HIV/AIDS Cluster Working Group, and the Child Protection Sector Working Group. IRC also partners with its other sectors and units. It works with the ERD unit for their technical support for the livelihoods component, and the Child and Youth Protection and Development unit for collaboration with psychosocial support, as well as livelihoods programs for war-affected children and youth.

In the LEAP project operational areas of Gulu and Pader, some of AVSI's partner organizations include Gulu Youth Development Organization, Women and Children First Organization in Gulu, AIDS Clients and Disabled Orphans Support in Gulu, and the Northern Uganda Community Based Action for Children with Disabilities. AVSI was implementing the two-year Northern Uganda Rehabilitation Program,⁶⁵ funded by the European Union, for internally displaced youths and adults between 14 and 30 years to access secondary school, vocational training programs, and income-generation activities. The project ended in August 2009. It also works with the Dutch Government and UNICEF to support nurseries, special needs centers, and the rehabilitation of primary and secondary schools to address the need of returning internally displaced persons. From 2006 to 2008, AVSI implemented the Camp Management and Return Monitoring program in partnership with the United Nations Refugee Agency in the districts of Gulu, Kitgum, and Pader. AVSI is implementing various water and sanitation projects funded by Educational Concerns for Hunger Organization and the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance to provide boreholes, rainwater harvesting tanks in schools and health centers, hand-

⁶⁵ This program ended in August 2009.

washing facilities, and latrines; AVSI is also implementing the USAID-funded SPRING project for vocational training. In the area of health, psychosocial support, and HIV/AIDS prevention, AVSI works with a number of donor agencies in the region, including UNICEF.

8.1.4 Government Involvement

The level of national and local government involvement in the project and commitment to working toward child labor elimination is high. Government officials at all levels have confirmed a close working relationship with LEAP project staff and commented that their support was “timely” and “greatly appreciated.” An example of their close cooperation at the district level is the Gulu District Local Government’s report, “Follow-up Inspection of Primary Schools in Gulu District Under AVSI LEAP Project” from July 30, 2009, which mentions the joint efforts to implement the government’s Quality Enhancement Initiative.

Stakeholders interviewed were aware of the sustainability plans—providing the evaluator with copies of it—and seemed active in focusing on exit strategies. For example, the DEOs could already identify activities that they could sustain, such as infusion of child labor issues into government committees, meetings, strategic plans, and guidelines. Public campaigning, advocacy, sensitization, and awareness-raising are other areas stakeholders believe can be sustained—from national level to district and school level. The development of bylaws at sub-county level (as follow-on from ordinances at the district level) is already in the planning process. Hence, the likelihood that parts of the exit/phase-out and sustainability plans will be effective in ensuring continued efforts to combat child labor is well developed. The areas that stakeholders are less certain of continuing due to insufficient resources are the livelihood activities, such as vocational training and apprenticeships; however, the introduction of VSLAs is a possibility, depending upon mechanisms for self-management.

8.1.5 Toward Sustainability

To complement exit and sustainability plans, government and community involvement, and policy reform, the LEAP project has taken additional steps to promote the sustainability of project components through a school-based approach to awareness-raising and training.

School-Based Approach to Awareness-Raising and Training

To increase awareness on the impacts of exploitive child labor and the importance of education, the LEAP project has taken a school-based approach that involves a wide array of actors such as students, teachers, SMCs, PTAs, and interested community members to conduct sensitization training. The school is therefore the entry point to awareness-raising. The LEAP project approach, again building upon past experiences and previous USDOL-funded child labor programs in northern Uganda, is to focus on the school, not only as a learning center but as a vibrant and friendly social environment that harmonizes learning with recreation and interesting awareness-raising activities. The project ensures that schools are a safe place where teachers can respect students and abide by the teachers’ code of conduct to provide an environment conducive for teaching and learning. Aspects of this approach include peer learning (in which students learn from each other; parents learn from each other; and teachers learn from each other) and cross-

generational cooperation (particularly through the participation of students and parents in school activities and development decisions).

Project staff, including Coordinating Center tutors, train teachers and SMC/PTA members on child labor issues and facilitate continued meetings and training to other teachers and school communities in topics such as the whole school improvement approach, mitigating child labor in their community, girl's education, and positive disciplinary alternatives to corporal punishment. The LEAP project also organizes a one-day seminar for students on their role as change agents, as well as life skills and music, dance, and drama activities, including public speaking and essay-writing competitions. The evaluator noted that, through this approach, students knew their rights and responsibilities, participated in activities such as creating or adding to existing talking compounds (messages on child labor in the schoolyards), were actively engaged in community campaigns against child labor, and were aware of ways children can be protected in their home, school, and community. In previous Ugandan child labor evaluations, the evaluator was concerned that students did not know where to go to be protected or safe from harm, but during the LEAP project evaluation, child protection has become an issue at the forefront of students' awareness and in ensuring the protection of children within their family and neighboring families. Students supported by the LEAP project expressed a strong desire to "help other children" and to "protect other children."

8.2 SUSTAINABILITY: LESSONS LEARNED

8.2.1 Student Participation

It appears that when students participate in school-based activities and development decisionmaking, they become more confident, articulate, responsible, and have a wider awareness of community spirit through a sense of belonging. They become empowered and feel that they are an important contributor to their own well-being and the well-being of others (especially children), as well as an advocate for community action.

8.3 SUSTAINABILITY: BEST PRACTICES

8.3.1 School-Based Approach to Awareness-Raising

A school-based approach to awareness-raising, sensitization, and training of the wider community has the potential to bring about sustainable changes in attitudes and behavior toward child labor, through everyone's involvement and inclusivity in actions to mitigate child labor and protect children from exploitation.

IX DISCUSSION

The midterm evaluation highlights a number of best practices implemented by the LEAP project as well as lessons learned.

9.1 SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEARNED

1. Learning from past experiences and previous USDOL-funded child labor programs in Uganda has produced a sound project design relevant to the political, economic, and cultural context of the region.
2. The project appropriately targeted the districts of Moroto, Gulu, Pader, and Kitgum.
3. It was highly appropriate for the project to focus on three major components: livelihoods, education, and child protection.
4. Compatibility of the project design with existing government and donor initiatives strengthens programs in child labor and related programs, avoids duplication, and promotes wider coverage of programs.
5. Rapid field assessments provide an effective means of identifying WFCL in a region.
6. Inter-sectoral cooperation and collaboration (i.e., other sectors within the same company) improves efficiency of effort and costs.
7. The livelihoods component (vocational training and apprenticeships) has not met expectations due to a number of factors, such as inadequate budgeting, limited resources and vocational institutions, limited availability of artisans, distances to institutions and apprenticeship centers, and insufficient selection criteria for formal vocational institutions.
8. The establishment of VSLAs, the element of the livelihoods component that has shown signs of success during the pilot phase, is yet to be implemented in all districts.
9. The teacher training found to be most useful includes guidance and counseling, managing large classrooms (using alternative disciplinary methods to corporal punishment), cooperative learning, and the design of low-cost or no-cost instructional materials.
10. Alternative basic education programs are effective if students have the opportunity to be mainstreamed into formal education, skills training, or employment.
11. School clubs can be strengthened through teacher involvement and direction, constant communication with parents on the students' activities, activities that are part of the school's core curriculum, activities that build upon students' interests, and well-planned activities.

12. Student participation in school and community development decisionmaking can lead to more confident, articulate students with a wider awareness of community responsibility.
13. The work status of project-supported students should be monitored on weekends and school vacations to determine whether children are relapsing into WFCL.
14. The work status and number of hours worked should form an element of intake and follow-up forms to enable the project to assess the progress of students and whether the number of hours worked per week are declining through educational interventions.
15. Continuous communication, involvement in national committees, and productive working relationships can lead to effective facilitation of national policies.

9.2 SUMMARY OF BEST PRACTICES

1. The project's use of GIS and community mapping to identify schools for selection within a specific distance from target communities.
2. The project's focus on girls' education and protection through factors such as promoting female teacher role models, enrollment into PTCs, 50% enrollment into the LEAP project, the provision of sanitary items for individuals and within schools, the establishment of guidance and counseling rooms, counselors in schools, training on guidance and counseling to teachers and school staff, supporting girls in secondary boarding schools, and the designation of match funding to girls' education.
3. The WSIP as a holistic model to address the barriers to quality education through activities such as management guidance and training, teacher training, awareness-raising on child labor, provision of equipment and materials, encouragement of community participation models, and assistance to conduct national examinations.
4. The implementation of pilot programs to pre-test activities or models before wider implementation as a cost-efficient method and means for continuous improvement.
5. The establishment of guidance and counseling rooms or designated areas in schools.
6. Remedial classes for students.
7. Support and inclusion of students with special needs and disabilities in the LEAP project (aligned with the government's Inclusive Education policy).
8. The infusion of child labor, gender, child protection, and life skills into the P4–P7 curriculum.
9. The infusion of child labor, child protection, and life skills into the teacher training coursework for the diploma in special needs in the Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation at Kyambogo University.

10. Support to students in PTCs in areas where there is a lack of teachers, particularly female teachers, to promote role models.
11. VSLAs as an avenue for community members to work together for individual financial gain (such as starting their own small business) and to share funds for a common development cause within the community.
12. The CLMS uses a combination of effective processes such as a referral system, community-based child labor monitoring, and the support of local government officials.
13. The monitoring of mobile populations through regular follow-up and the implementation of a verification process that provides a comprehensive check of schools and beneficiaries, through confirmation of age, class, attendance, knowledge of child labor, school performance, progress of school committees, and community-based labor monitors.
14. The development of district ordinances and sub-county bylaws provide government commitment and enforcement of offences.
15. A school-based approach to awareness-raising has the potential to bring about sustainable attitudinal and behavioral changes toward child labor in the community through the involvement and inclusivity of all school and community members in strategies to mitigate child labor and protect children from exploitation.
16. The management of the project has been effective due to transparency, ongoing communication, clear direction, full documentation of decisions, and constant strategizing for improvements and resolutions to implementation challenges.

X RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following key recommendations are provided for consideration to successfully meet project objectives:

1. Capture working hours for each student beneficiary on intake forms and every follow-up form by amending the process for follow-up and data entry (record the number of days worked per week, the number of hours worked per day, and whether the child works for pay, no pay, or in-kind).
2. Monitor students closely on weekends and school vacations to prevent relapse into WFCL and consider documenting the results as action research for wider dissemination.
3. Conduct information-sharing visits and exchanges for LEAP project staff and other partners, teachers, and students between operational districts to discuss implementation strategies and for networking on a peer-to-peer basis (students in particular are information-deprived, especially in Moroto District, and have expressed a desire to speak to other students) or interest basis.
4. Place a key focus on action research for the remaining two years, such as youth action research, labor market skills analysis, child trafficking, HIV/AIDS behavior change, and sexual and gender-based violence and its impact on child labor (as documented in the project design).
5. Reconsider scaling up VSLAs in all five targeted districts, with availability of funding.
6. Monitor the employment options and opportunities for graduating students from vocational and apprenticeship programs and consider documenting the results as action research on graduate employment.
7. Continue teacher training as planned for secondary schools, particularly in guidance and counseling.
8. Reconsider the implementation of the apprenticeship model in all five targeted districts, with availability of funding.
9. Provide further research to track the impact of remedial classes.
10. Monitor and document the parent cost-sharing intervention during its pilot phase, particularly to determine whether students will relapse into exploitive labor if parents cannot afford to participate in cost sharing.
11. Continue discussions with the NCDC regarding collaboration to infuse child labor and life skills into the secondary school curriculum.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Abalo, Prossy (n.d.) Why was I born? (poem), Ober Primary School, Lira Municipal Council, Uganda

Abimanyi, L.K. (18 November 2009) Uganda's districts grow beyond size, Daily Monitor, Uganda

Adilang Institute of Technology (September 2009) Proposed Five Year Development Plan 2009-2014, Adilang Sub-County, Pader

Atanga Girls' Secondary (February 2009) School Three Year Plan, Laguti Sub-County, Pader

AVSI (October 2009) Minute of the Education Cluster Meeting Held on 7th October 2009 at Teachers' Resource Centre

AVSI (2008) Development Has a Face: AVSI Uganda 2008 Annual Report

Borrety, Acayo (n.d.) Child Labor is Bad (poem), Dicwini Primary School, Kitgum District, Uganda

Gulu District Local Government (September 2009) Gulu District Mock Examination 2009 Analysis, Directorate of Education and Sports Office, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (22 October 2009) Gulu District Ordinance on Quality Assurance in Education and Sports, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (October 2009) Invitation to 19th Full Council Meeting, Office of the District Speaker, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (June 2009) Inspection Report on Primary Schools under AVSI LEAP Project, Department of Education and Sports, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (October 2009) Requisition for District Supplement to the 2009 PLE Management, Directorate of Education and Sports Office, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (July 2009) Report on Follow Up Inspection of Primary Schools in Gulu District under AVSI LEAP Project, Department of Education and Sports, Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (2009) Revised DDP 2009-2010, Department of Education and Sports

Gulu District Local Government (September 2009) Sustainability Action Plan (LEAP), Gulu

Gulu District Local Government (June 2008) Three-Year Rolled Development Plan (2008/9-2010/11), Approved under Council Minute 29/COUN/2008, 11th Full Council Meeting, Gulu

IRC (n.d.) Apprenticeship Program Guidelines, LEAP Project

IRC (July 2008) Awareness Raising Strategies for LEAP

IRC (August 2009) Child Labor in Northern Uganda & Karamoja Regions

IRC (September 2008) Direct Beneficiaries' Selection Criteria & Process, LEAP Project

IRC (n.d.) Guideline for Enrolment of Beneficiaries into the LEAP Project

IRC (n.d.) Guideline for School-based Approach to Awareness Raising and Training

IRC (October 2009) IRC Uganda Staffing Structure (Organogram)

IRC (November 2008) LEAP Database Child Tracking User Guide, Version 2.0

IRC (November 2008) LEAP Database Replication and Synchronizing Manual

IRC (April 2008) LEAP Follow-up Form (Monitoring Form)

IRC (May 2008) LEAP Intake Form

IRC (November 2008) LEAP Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Verification Exercise 24–28 November 2008–Gulu District

IRC (n.d.) LEAP Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Verification Exercise–Pader District

IRC (July 2008) LEAP Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Verification Exercise Report–Kitgum

IRC (February 2008) LEAP Monitoring and Evaluation Report: Verification Exercise Report 16–23 February 2009–Moroto District (Draft)

IRC (n.d.) LEAP Project Benefits to Children, Parents & Communities

IRC (October 2009) LEAP Project Organogram

IRC (March 2009) LEAP Revised Timeline March TPR 2009

IRC (June 2009) List of Hazardous Work Not Permitted for Employment of Children in Uganda (Draft)

IRC (n.d.) Livelihood, Skills Training and Income Generation Activities: With Sustainability in Mind, LEAP Project

IRC (n.d.) Promoting Girls' Education: The IRC Strategy

IRC (October 2009) Special Report: Increasing Access to Girl Child Education in Northern Uganda, The Hopper-Dean Family Fund of the Harris myCFO Foundation

IRC (July 2008) Strategy Accelerated Learning Program, LEAP Project

IRC (September 2009) Sustainability and Phase Out Plan, Revised September 2009, LEAP Project

IRC (n.d.) Talking Points for Women's Day Celebration

IRC (October 2008) The LEAP Project Data Management Protocol

IRC (August 2009) The LEAP Project Promises in the Project Document

IRC (October 2009) The LEAP Project Summary, Updated 17 October 2009

IRC (n.d.) To All Parents and Children, LEAP Project

IRC (n.d.) Whole School Improvement Program (WSIP) Strategy

IRC (2008) 2008 Annual Report, Uganda

IRC and AVSI Foundation (May 2009) Child Labor Situation Analysis Report, Conducted in Northern Uganda and the Karamoja sub-region of Uganda, LEAP Project

IRC and AVSI Foundation (n.d) LEAP Enrollment Form

IRC Uganda Country Program (2009) Increase Access to Reliable Financial Services (Savings and Lending) to Parents, Teachers and the Communities Supported by Livelihoods, Education and Protection to End Child Labor (LEAP) Project, Final Report (July 2008–January 2009), IRC's Economic Recovery Development Sector

JSI Research and Training Inc (2009) Northern Uganda Malaria AIDS & Tuberculosis (NUMAT) Program, <http://osiris.jsi.com>

Kitgum District (September 2009) Kitgum District Education Ordinance Memorandum, Kitgum

Kitgum District (September 2009) Sustainability Action Plan (LEAP), Kitgum

Kyambogo University (September 2009) Proposed (Revised) Curriculum for Diploma in Special Needs Education (DSNE), Faculty of Special Needs and Rehabilitation, Dept of Special Needs Studies, Uganda

Local Government of Lira (2009) The Local Government's Child Protection Ordinance, Uganda

Lynd, M. (April 2009) Evaluation of the REPLICA Project, Basic Education & Policy Support III Project

Ministry of Education and Sports (November 2001) Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards Indicators for Educational Institutions, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (2005) Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality, Module 1–Leadership in Education, USAID, BEPS, UPHOLD, Second Edition, Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (November 2007) Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality, Module 2–Towards Improved Classroom Instruction: “Cooperative Learning in the Classroom,” USAID, BEPS, UPHOLD, Second Edition, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (2006) Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality, Module 3–Managing School Finances, USAID, BEPS, UPHOLD, First Edition, Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (2006) Education Management Strengthening Initiative: Managing for Quality, Module 4–Managing the School Curriculum, USAID, BEPS, UPHOLD, First Edition, Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (May 2007) Facilitators’ Master Guide for Educational Leaders and Managers: REPLICA Roll-out, Department of Special Education, Guidance and Counseling, USAID UNITY, First Edition, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (2006) Leadership and Governance: A Handbook for School Managers—a component of REPLICA, USAID BEPS, First Edition, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (n.d.) Peace Education: Learner’s Book, Lower Primary, USAID, BEPS, UNITY, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (n.d.) Peace Education: Learner’s Book, Upper Primary, USAID, BEPS, UNITY, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (n.d.) REPLICA: Revitalizing Education, Participation and Learning in Conflict Areas, USAID UNITY, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (2007) School Management Committee Handbook, Revised Edition, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Education and Sports (n.d.) The Teacher’s Professional Code of Conduct, Uganda

Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (November 2006) National Child Labor Policy, Republic of Uganda

Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development (September 2009) The Popular Version of The National Child Labor Policy, Third Draft, Republic of Uganda

National Curriculum Development Committee (n.d.) Themes for Infusion (Draft)

Okello, John Bosco (n.d.) Child Labor (poem), P6, Ober Primary School, Lira, Uganda

St. Martin's Vocational Training Center Opit, (February 2009) Development Workplan, Academic Year 2009/2010

Tumwesigye, Elioda (2003) Fountain Youth Survival Kit for Schools (written in local language), Fountain Publisher, Kampala

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (August 2009) Understanding Children's Work in Uganda, Country Report

Uganda National Teachers' Union (n.d.) Code of Ethics: Key to Professionalism, Netherlands Government

UDSOL and IRC (September 2007) Project Document under USDOL and the International Rescue Committee, IRC Cooperative Agreement, IL-16571-07-75-K (often referred to as PRODOC)

UMEMS (December 2008) The Midterm Evaluation of USAID/Uganda's UNITY Program: Final Report

ANNEX B: ITINERARY SCHEDULE

DATE	SITE VISITS
KAMPALA	
19 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Kampala Office Staff • IRC Uganda – Country Director • AVSI Uganda – Country Director • National Curriculum Development Center • Kyambogo University – Faculty of Special Needs & Rehabilitation
20 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Kampala Office Staff • Ministry of Gender, Labor & Social Development • Ministry of Education and Sports • National Council for Children
MOROTO DISTRICT	
21 October 2009 Travel by air (1.5 hrs) to Moroto District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moroto LEAP Field Staff (IRC) • KDA Primary School (Moroto Municipality) • Moroto LEAP Data Clerk (IRC)
22 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kangole Girls Secondary School (Matany Sub-County) • Natiakwae stone quarry (Nadunget Sub-County) • Kasimeri stone quarry (Nadunget Sub-County) • Save the Children* • Coordinating Center Tutor (CCT)* • Moroto Primary Teachers' College (PTC) • District Inspector of Schools (DIS) <p>{* District Education Officer and the Probation & Welfare Officer not available}</p>
GULU DISTRICT	
23 October 2009 Travel by air (3 hrs) to Gulu District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Field Staff (AVSI) • Gulu Central High School & Board of Governors • St. Peter's Primary School & SMC/PTA • Comboni Samaritans of Gulu (NGO)* • LEAP Field Staff (AVSI)
24 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Data Clerk (AVSI) • Laroo Division stone quarry
25 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekend

DATE	SITE VISITS
26 October 2009 Travel by road (1.5 hrs) to Aromo Wanglobo Travel by road (2 hrs) to Pader District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aromo Wanglobo Primary School (Odek Sub-County) & SMC/PTA • Women's Group–Awere Trading Center • St. Martin's Vocational School (Lakwana Sub-County) • Gulu District Education Office • Gulu District Labor Office • Gulu Core Primary Teachers' College & Coordinating Center Tutors
PADER DISTRICT	
27 October 2009 Travel by road (1 hr) to Adilang	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Field Staff (AVSI) • LEAP Data Clerk (AVSI) • Pader District Education Office • Pader District Labor Office • Adilang Institute of Technology • Adilang stone quarry
28 October 2009 Travel by road (0.5 hr) to Kitgum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atanga Primary School (Laguti Sub-County) & SMC/PTA • Atanga Girls Secondary School (Laguti Sub-County) & Board of Governors • Laguti Sub-County Community Awareness Group
KITGUM DISTRICT	
28 October 2009 (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP Field Staff (IRC) • Kitgum Village Savings & Loans Association (VSLA) • Kitgum St. Mary's Boys Primary School • Apprenticeship artisans & student –tailoring, hairdressing • LEAP Data Clerk (IRC)
29 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Education Office • District Probation & Welfare Office • Apprenticeship artisans & students–catering • Kitgum Women's Awareness Group • Palabek Senior Secondary School (Palabek Sub-County) & SMC/PTA • Dicwini Primary School (Palabek Sub-County) & SMC/PTA
30 October 2009	Travel by road (2 hrs) from Kitgum District to Gulu District Travel by air (45 min) from Gulu District to Kampala
KAMPALA	
31 October 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekend
1 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for Stakeholders Meeting
2 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparation for Stakeholders Meeting

DATE	SITE VISITS
3 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAKEHOLDER MEETING—Grand Imperial Hotel • ILO—IPEC Chief Technical Advisor • LEAP Staff • U.S. Embassy
4 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debrief with IRC & AVSI Staff
5 November 2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depart Uganda

* indicates additional visit not previously scheduled

ANNEX F: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE for the Independent Midterm Evaluation of Livelihoods, Education & Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (L.E.A.P.)

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-16571-07-75-K
Financing Agency: Grantee Organization: Dates of Project Implementation:	U.S. Department of Labor The International Rescue Committee (IRC) and Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale (AVSI) September 30, 2007–September 30, 2011
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Midterm Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	October 19–November 4, 2009
Preparation Date of TOR:	August 19, 2009
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US\$5,499,997
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	ICF Macro Headquarters, 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

I BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over US\$720 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school;
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor; and
5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects—decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

USDOL reports annually to Congress on a number of indicators. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees is accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the U.S. Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs⁶⁶:

1. International Labour Organization’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)

Since 1995, the US Congress has earmarked some US\$410 million to support the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC), making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include “direct action” components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitive and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by ILO-IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and non-formal education. Most ILO-IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

⁶⁶ In 2007, the U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL’s appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

2. Child Labor Education Initiative

Since 2001, the US Congress has provided some US\$249 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

Other Initiatives

Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO-IPEC program or the EI.

Project Context

In Uganda, children work in crop farming, commercial agriculture and fishing, as well as in the urban informal sector, where children sell small items on the streets, and work in shops, garages, bars, restaurants, and in brick making and laying. Children also work in cross border trade with counterparts in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan, engage in domestic work, and in stone quarrying and crushing. Some children as young as 10 years are victims of commercial sexual exploitation, and Uganda is a source, destination, and transit country for the trafficking of children.⁶⁷

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Uganda, having devoted over US\$14.7 million since 1999 to combat child labor in the country alone. USDOL has also contributed over US\$27.5 million to regional projects in Africa which include Uganda. USDOL funds a 4-year, US\$4.79 million Project of Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor, implemented by ILO-IPEC.⁶⁸ The project aims to withdraw 2,712 and prevent 5,426 children from exploitive child labor in agriculture, commercial sexual exploitation, fishing, domestic work, construction, mining, quarrying, and the urban informal sector. The project will also contribute to the development of “child labor-free

⁶⁷ USDOL, *USDOL's 2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor*, p341

⁶⁸ ILO-IPEC, *Project of Support for the Preparatory Phase of the Uganda National Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour*, Project Document, Geneva, September 26, 2008. i

zones” in Wakiso, Rakai, and Mbale Districts.⁶⁹ USDOL funded the 4-year Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) project, which was funded by USDOL at US\$14.5 million and World Vision at US\$5.8 million, which ended in March 2009. In Uganda, the project withdrew and prevented 8,176 children from exploitive child labor.⁷⁰ USDOL funded the US\$3 million ILO-IPEC project to combat HIV/AIDS-induced child labor in Uganda and Zambia, which ended in December 2008.⁷¹ The project withdrew 2,642 and prevented an additional 2,072 children from exploitive child labor through the provision of education, in both countries.⁷² USDOL also funded another 4-year project, Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent and Child Labor through Education (ORACLE), implemented by International Rescue Committee (IRC) and *Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale* (AVSI), at US\$3.6 million, which ended in August 2007, and withdrew or prevented 5,657 children from exploitive labor in Northern Uganda.⁷³ This project established the foundation for the project that will be evaluated under this TOR.

The Government of Uganda has participated in these and other initiatives to combat child labor and child trafficking, and has implemented policy and legal frameworks to address these problems. The minimum age for admission to work in Uganda is 14 years, though children between the ages of 12 and 14 years may engage in light work. The law prohibits slavery and forced labor, and offenses related to trafficking in persons are prohibited as well. The Ministry of Gender, Labor, and Social Development (MGLSD) is charged with enforcing child labor laws and investigates child labor complaints through district labor officers. According to USDOS, local district officials and labor inspectors in the north collaborated with ILO-IPEC to enhance their capacity to cover the region. This included increasing labor inspectors’ mobility and information collection, and working with district child labor committees, with the aim of overcoming the lack of resources for the north.⁷⁴

The MGLSD increased the budget for the Child Labor Unit for fiscal year 2007, as a result of the official launch of the National Child Labor Policy in May, 2007. The Child and Family Protection Unit of the National Police participated in training 163 police, security, and other officials on child labor, with the support of ILO-IPEC. The Government also continued to provide assistance to returning children who had been abducted by the Lord’s Resistance Army, and transferred 546 children to rehabilitation centers.⁷⁵ In addition to USDOL projects, the Government of Uganda has participated in projects affecting child labor funded by other donors. During fiscal year 2007, USDOS funded a US\$380,000 project implemented by the IOM in Northern Uganda. The project aims to reintegrate trafficking victims including children from the

⁶⁹ Ibid., p30-31, p46-48

⁷⁰ Macro International Inc., *Independent Final Evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) Project*, 2009, p12

⁷¹ ILO-IPEC, *Combating and Preventing HIV/AIDS-induced Child Labour in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Action in Uganda and Zambia*, Project Document, Geneva, July 2004, i, 14. See also ILO-IPEC, *Combating and Preventing HIV/AIDS-induced Child Labour in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Action in Uganda and Zambia*, Final Report, December 10, 2008, 1

⁷² ILO-IPEC, *Combating HIV/AIDS-induced Child Labour*, Final Report-2008, 33

⁷³ USDOL, p343

⁷⁴ USDOL, p342

⁷⁵ USDOL, p343

Democratic Republic of Congo. Also during fiscal year 2007, USAID funded a US\$500,000 project implemented by the IRC and UNICEF to provide care to returnees from abduction by the Lord's Resistance Army. In addition, the European Commission provided US\$940,000 to UNICEF for the child protection program in Northern Uganda, including support for formerly abducted children. UNICEF also implements a Karamoja Alternative Basic Education program for children working as cattle herders.⁷⁶ Uganda is an ILO-IPEC participating country⁷⁷ and ratified ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labor in 2001.⁷⁸

Livelihoods, Education & Protection to End Child Labor in Uganda (L.E.A.P)

On September 30, 2007, International Rescue Committee (IRC) and Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale (AVSI) received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth US\$5,499,997 from USDOL to implement an EI project in Uganda, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of USDOL projects as outlined above. IRC and AVSI were awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project targets 2,825 children for withdrawal and 8,450 for prevention from the worst forms of child labor. Project interventions focus on children affected by armed conflict in the Northern Districts of Kitgum, Lira, Pader, Amuru and Gulu; and the Karamoja districts of Moroto and Nakapiripirit. The project targets the sectors of agriculture, domestic service, petty trade, construction, herding, and brewing beer. The project will reach an additional 14,725 indirect beneficiaries, who will attend target schools or be a part of households who benefit from livelihood activities.

The project's goal is to contribute to the prevention and elimination of child labor in Northern Uganda and the Karamoja region.

The intermediate objectives are to:

- Promote an enabling environment to increase awareness of child labor at Government, community, family and care giver levels;
- Increase access to education for children engaged in, or at risk of engaging in child labor; and
- Improve the quality of basic education through curriculum improvement and teacher support.

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The L.E.A.P project in Uganda commenced implementation in September 2007 and is due for midterm evaluation in 2009.

⁷⁶ Ibid

⁷⁷ USDOL, p341

⁷⁸ International Labour Organization, *Convention No. C182*, <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/ratifce.pl?C182>

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with IRC and AVSI. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, and replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

Midterm Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the midterm evaluation is to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government;
2. Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
3. Provide recommendations toward how the project can successfully overcome challenges to meet its objectives and targets by the time the project ends;
4. Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies and the project's strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and identify areas in need of improvement; and
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations, and identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives.

The evaluation should also identify emerging lessons learned, potential good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in Uganda and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL, IRC and AVSI and provide direction in making any revisions to workplans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements, and resource allocations that may be needed in order for the project to increase its effectiveness and meet its objectives. Recommendations should focus on ways in which the project can move forward in order to reach its objectives and make any necessary preparations or adjustments in order to promote the sustainability of project activities. The evaluation should also assess government involvement and commitment in its recommendations for sustainability.

Intended Users

This midterm evaluation should provide USDOL, IRC, AVSI, and other project stakeholders an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. USDOL, IRC and AVSI management will use the evaluation results as a learning tool regarding the relevance of the approach and strategy being used by the project. The evaluation results should also be used by IRC and AVSI, the Government of Uganda and other current or potential partners to enhance effectiveness in the implementation. Therefore, the evaluation should provide credible and reliable information in order to suggest how the project could enhance its impact during the remaining time of implementation, ensuring the sustainability of the benefits that have been or will be generated.

The final report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below, according to five categories of issues. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL and ICF Macro.

Relevance

The evaluation should consider the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?
2. Have the project assumptions been accurate and realistic? How, if applicable, have critical assumptions been changed?
3. What are the principle project components and coordination structures of the project?
4. What are the project's main strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? Please assess the relevance of these strategies.
5. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.)? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?

6. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works? Specifically, how does the project design address the needs of children affected by war and conflict?
7. How has the project design been compatible with existing initiatives, by the government and other organizations, to combat child labor, and with other relevant assistance efforts?
8. Assess the relevance of the project's criteria for selecting the targeted program regions and sectors, and subsequently project beneficiaries. What other major design - issues should be brought to the attention of IRC/AVSI and USDOL?

Effectiveness

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives. Specifically, the evaluation should address:

1. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (agriculture, trade, construction, domestic work, hunting/fishing/herding, brewing beer)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?
2. At midterm, is the project on track in terms of meeting its targets/objectives? If not, what seem to be the factors contributing to delays, where are the delays (districts, or components, such as "whole school improvement") and how far behind is the project in terms of target numbers and objectives? What could be changed/improved to meet targets?
3. Assess the effectiveness of the "direct action" interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (i.e. formal primary, formal secondary, non-formal vocational, non-formal alternative education, curriculum for students who struggle to pass exams). Did the provision of these services results in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?
4. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children prevented and withdrawn from labor/trafficking.
5. Assess the effectiveness of the project's partnership with local universities.
6. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models (such as Alternative Basic Education, Whole School Improvement) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.

7. Are there any sector-specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
8. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Is it feasible and effective? Why or why not? How does the project monitor work status after school and during holidays?
9. How did the project successfully monitor the highly mobile population? Could this system be a best practice for other projects?
10. What are the management strengths of this project? What management areas need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?
11. What are key stakeholders' (IRC/AVSI leadership, project staff, and partners?), perspectives about how and why implementation has been challenging and/ or successful? Based on this, what changes should be made to the implementation plans, project approaches, and activities?

Efficiency

The evaluation should provide analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) compared with its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). Specifically, the evaluation should address:

1. Is the project cost-efficient in terms of the scale of the interventions, and the expected direct and long-term impacts?
2. Are the project strategies efficient in terms of the use of financial and human resources? What alternatives are there?
3. Are the monitoring and reporting system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project (such as the highly mobile population)?

Impact

The evaluation should assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country – as reported by respondents. Specifically, it should address:

1. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc)?
2. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?
3. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?

4. If applicable, assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and non-formal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and communities?
5. Are there any emerging trends or issues that the project should and/or could respond to in order to increase the impact and relevance of the project? Are there any emerging opportunities to take the work further/have greater impact?
6. At midterm, are there good practices by the project or the implementing partners (i.e. technical, management, monitoring, etc.) that might be replicated in other areas, or considered to be innovative solutions to the current situation?

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the project's approaches and benefits continue after the completion of the project, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government, and identify areas where this may be strengthened. Specifically, it should address:

1. Does the grantee have an exit strategy and sustainability plan been integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?
2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?
3. What have been the major challenges and successes in initiating and maintaining partnerships, as well as with coordination among different child labor actors and projects (including ILO-IPEC, other US-funded projects, international/multilateral organizations, and other national NGOs/community-based organizations), in support of the project?
4. Assess the level of involvement of local/national government in the project and how this involvement has built government capacity and commitment to work on child labor elimination.
5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of initiating and maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), the National Steering Committee on Child Labor and the National Task Force on Child Labor, as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?
6. What additional steps need to be taken in order to promote the sustainability of project components?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

A. Approach

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data will be drawn from project reports to the extent that it is available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (<http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments to be made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B. Midterm Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The international evaluator
2. An interpreter fluent in the district language and English who will travel with the evaluator.

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process.

The international evaluator is Dr. Martina Nicolls. She will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with ICF Macro and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the national consultant and interpreter for the field work; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

The responsibility of the interpreter/s in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluation team is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

C. Data Collection Methodology

1. Document Review

Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents. During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected.

Documents may include:

- Project document and revisions,
- Cooperative Agreement,
- Technical Progress and Status Reports,
- Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
- Work plans,
- Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
- Management Procedures and Guidelines,
- Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and
- Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question in order to make decisions on the allocation of time in the field and stakeholders to be interviewed. It will also help the evaluator to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where evaluation findings are coming from.

3. Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with:

- ILAB/OCFT Staff
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- ILO-IPEC
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials, including officials from the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) project focal desk and the National Council of Children
- Partners from Kyambogo University
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International NGOs (such as World Vision) and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- Labor Reporting Officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative

4. Field Visits

The evaluator will visit a number of project sites in collaboration with the implementing partners IRC and AVSI, as well as DOL. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted child labor sectors and geographic regions. During the visits the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Interview groups with children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E. Stakeholder Meeting

Following the field visits, a stakeholders' meeting will be conducted by the evaluator that brings together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork, and will be limited to approximately 25-30 key stakeholders. The stakeholder meeting will be conducted on November 3rd in Kampala.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary finding and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders will be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback.

The agenda is expected to include some of the following items:

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

F. Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator visits a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

G. Timetable and Workplan

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

Activity	Responsible Party	Proposed Date(s)
Phone interview with DOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters	ICF Macro, DOL, Grantee, Evaluator	August 12
Desk Review	Evaluator	August–October
Question Matrix and Instruments due to ICF Macro/DOL	Evaluator	September 10
Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and DOL	DOL/ICF Macro/Evaluator	October 9
International Travel	n/a	October 18
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	October 19
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	October 20-30
National Stakeholder Meeting	n/a	November 3
International Travel	n/a	November 5
Post-evaluation debrief call with DOL	n/a	November 12
Draft report to ICF Macro for QC review	Evaluator	November 19
Draft report to DOL for 48 hour review	ICF Macro	November 20
Draft report released to stakeholders	ICF Macro	November 25
Comments due to ICF Macro	DOL/Grantee & Stakeholders	December 11
Report revised and sent to ICF Macro	Evaluator	December 28
Revised report sent to DOL	ICF Macro	December 30
Final approval of report	DOL	January 13
Finalization & distribution of report	ICF Macro	February 5

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator’s return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to ICF Macro. The following structure and content is provided:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and three key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description

VI. Relevance

- A. Findings - answering the TOR questions
- B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

VII. Effectiveness

- A. Findings – answering the TOR questions
- B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

VIII. Efficiency

- A. Findings – answering the TOR questions
- B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

IX. Impact

- A. Findings – answering the TOR questions
- B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

X. Sustainability

- A. Findings – answering the TOR questions
- B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

XI. Recommendations and Conclusions

- A. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives
- B. Other Recommendations – as needed
 - 1. Relevance
 - 2. Effectiveness
 - 3. Efficiency
 - 4. Impact
 - 5. Sustainability

XII. Annexes—including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 45 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by ICF Macro and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate. ICF Macro will prepare a template matrix of stakeholder comments, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, using the comment matrix, with reasons why any stakeholder comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on November 13, 2009, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on December 28, 2009, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in English.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF Macro has contracted with Dr. Martina Nicolls to conduct this evaluation. Dr. Nicolls has over two decades experience working in international education with a particular emphasis on post-conflict reconstruction and child labor. She previously served as the lead evaluator for the KURET regional final evaluation and conducted field work in northern Uganda to assess the Uganda KURET project activities. Dr. Nicolls holds a PhD in Educational Administration and Supervision and has evaluated education, community development, and poverty alleviation projects funded by USAID, the Asian Development Bank, and the European Commission. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant IRC and AVSI staff to evaluate this project.

ICF Macro will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. ICF Macro will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.